The Catholic Historical Review

Volume XXXI OCTOBER, 1945 No. 3

GEORGE III, PITT, AND THE IRISH CATHOLICS, 1801 - 1805

FOR some years after the Union of Great Britain and Ireland came into effect, the question of Catholic Emancipation, which had been a prominent issue in the political struggles in Ireland during the preceding two decades, was allowed to drop from public notice. The chance of settling it under the most favorable conditions by making it in effect a part of the Union, was lost when George III refused to sanction any change in the existing laws. The king's intervention was decisive, at least for the present. Pitt's plan of relieving the Catholics of their political disabilities, and of carrying certain other reforms of immediate and practical benefit to the mass of the Irish people, was wrecked before it reached the stage of parliamentary debate; and when he and his fellow ministers resigned in March, 1801, leaving the government of the United Kingdom in the less competent hands of Addington and his reactionary supporters, discussion of these reforms was abruptly ended.

To the Catholic leaders in Ireland, to men like Archbishop Troy, Lord Fingal, Lord Kenmare, and others, who had supported the Union in the expectation of benefits to be conferred, this development came as a keen disappointment. But they accepted the situation with quiet dignity and settled down to await a more favorable turn of events. That was the only course open to them. George III's intervention was not a secret, and it was obvious that to persist in the demand for relief against the opposition of the king and his new ministers would be worse than useless.

A more favorable prospect, or what in their ignorance they assumed to be a more favorable prospect, opened for the Catholic leaders when Pitt returned to office in May, 1804. After some months of deliberation a petition was drawn up, and in February, 1805, Lord Fingal and six other gentlemen were chosen by a representative meeting in Dublin to interview Pitt, and to request that he should present it to the House of Commons. The appeal to Pitt was unavailing; but the opposition leaders, Lord Grenville and Charles James Fox, readily undertook the task which the prime minister had declined. In the debates which ensued the Catholic claims were powerfully supported by these two leaders, by Henry Grattan, and by many others; but they were opposed by Pitt himself and by all his supporters, often on grounds that would forever have debarred the Catholics of the United Kingdom from the rights and privileges enjoyed by others; and in the end the petition was rejected by large majorities in both houses.

These events did much to determine the character of the struggle which followed, until O'Connell's victory over the forces of reaction in 1829. They have attracted relatively little notice; and it is the purpose of this article to examine the circumstances which led to the presenting of this first petition, and to its summary rejection by a parliament whose members prided themselves on their entire freedom from those passions and prejudices which had disfigured the parliament of Ireland, and rendered it unworthy of the authority which it claimed over the Irish people.

The Union had not, despite the predictions of its authors, facilitated the settlement of this question. It had, on the contrary, raised new barriers; and for the present at least, these appeared to be insuperable. The king's conscience had become a rallying point, not only for honest Protestant opinion, but for all the forces of ignorance, prejudice, and self-interest that could be marshalled to resist any concession to "Popery;" and against such opposition an appeal to reason was not likely to be very effective. The Irish Catholics had been reduced from the position of a majority whose power was steadily increasing, and who were possessed of means which must ultimately have forced concession from their own parliament, to that of a minority, removed from all contact with the authority which ruled them, and obliged to await the pleasure of an assembly whose opinions were

too faithfully represented by men like Addington, Abbott, and the future Lord Redesdale.[1]

They had the support of Fox and the Whigs, who alone protested against so dangerous an assumption of power by the monarch; and to these were added a certain number of Irish members who saw the necessity of settling the question at once and so laying the foundation of internal union in Ireland, without which the formal union of the two kingdoms could have but little value. But the advocates of emancipation were in a hopeless minority. The cause itself was discredited, unjustly but not wholly unnaturally, through its adoption by the United Irishmen, and its recent association with republicanism and rebellion. Its opponents were entrenched in every position of power, from the throne almost to the last minor office in Ireland; and although the new lord-lieutenant, the Earl of Hardwicke, was generally believed to hold more liberal opinions than other members of his government, it was soon evident that he had no intention of challenging the Ascendency on this, or any other issue.

One estimate of the situation, made by an informed observer while the change of ministry was in progress in 1801, is worth recording. Edward Cook, who had held the office of under-secretary in Dublin Castle for many years, and who had been Lord Castlereagh's principal agent in the negotiations which preceded the Union, was convinced that the great majority of the Irish Protestants were ready "to acquiesce in the concession." He foresaw opposition from some highly placed individuals, but he believed that there was "no man of common sense and temper" who did not think the change could safely be made. He warned against the danger of arousing popular clamor by a display of "the Protestant banner," or by encouragement to "the Orange spirit;" and he ridiculed the notion that a few more Dissenters and a dozen or so Roman Catholics in the imperial parliament could endanger the empire, or alter in the slightest degree the character of the

[1] Henry Addington, Speaker of the House of Commons to 1801, supported the Union as the only means of preventing further concessions to the Catholics. Charles Abbott succeeded Lord Castlereagh as chief secretary for Ireland in 1801; and Sir John Mitford, First Baron Redesdale, succeeded the Earl of Clare as Lord Chancellor in 1802. These two became the leaders of the extreme Protestant group in Ireland. Colchester, *Diary and Correspondence* (London, 1861), I, *passim*.

constitution. The arguments in favor of the change were, he maintained, irresistible; the dangers to be apprehended, purely imaginary. But the concession, he declared, must be made now, while "the Protestant mind was still acquiescent" and while the Catholics were free from any feeling of disappointment and bitterness.[2]

That estimate may have been correct; but the opinion of the Irish people, Protestant or Catholic, was no longer a factor of any importance. In so far as public opinion under the existing electoral system could affect the issue at all, the decisive influence would henceforth be, not the opinion of the Irish people who were most immediately concerned, but that of the Protestant majority in England and Scotland. George III's description of Pitt's modest plan of reform as "Jacobinical" appears somewhat absurd; but the use of the term may have been something more than the random shot of an excited and slightly deranged old man. In effect it was an appeal to the fears and prejudices of those classes in English society most likely to support the reactionary policy dictated by the king; and beyond the classes who saw the grim spectre of Jacobinism in every proposal of change, was the mob whose fury could be roused by the mere suggestion of yielding anything to Popery. The Gordon riots were a recent memory, and the spirit of savage fanaticism revealed by that unpleasant episode was still very far from being exorcised.

The negotiations between Pitt's government and the Irish Catholics, one of the strangest incidents in the history of British rule in Ireland, were ended in February, 1801, when the retiring lord-lieutenant, with the knowledge and approbation of the prime minister, issued a memorandum to the Catholic leaders explaining the turn which events had taken, and advising them on the "line of conduct" which, in their own interests, they ought to adopt. It was a carefully-worded document. The "prudential reserve" which had marked all of Lord Cornwallis' dealings with the Catholics was still very much in evidence. Yet the meaning was not in doubt, and the statement was intended

[2] This summary is based on letters to Clare and Castlereagh in February, 1801. Castlereagh, *Memoirs and Correspondence* (London, 1848), IV, 41-46, 47, 50 and 52.

for distribution among all Catholics who were interested in the subject.[3]

Pitt and his colleagues were, it was stated, "retiring from his Majesty's service" because they had found it impossible to bring forward "measures of concession to the Catholic body whilst in office," and because they considered that their retirement was "most likely to contribute to the ultimate success" of the measures which they planned. The Catholics were informed that they could "with confidence rely on the zealous support of all those who retired, and of many who remained in office, when it could be given with a prospect of success," and they were adjured to weigh carefully the advantage which they derived from this circumstance. In particular, they could rely upon the retiring prime minister. "They may be assured," it was said, "that Mr. Pitt will do his utmost to establish their cause in the public favour, and prepare the way for their finally attaining their objects."

In a second document given to Archbishop Troy and Lord Fingal at the same time, Lord Cornwallis went still further in his efforts to reassure the Catholics. He repeated the statement that Pitt and his fellow ministers had "sacrificed their situations" in the Catholic cause. He warned them, unnecessarily as it would seem, against the danger of "association with men of Jacobinical principles," or any conduct which would alienate the sympathies of the men who now espoused their cause; and he concluded with a statement that "the eminent characters" who had retired from office were "pledged not to embark in the service of government, except on terms of the Catholic privileges being obtained."[4]

Despite the unfavorable turn which events had taken, the Catholic leaders had, on the strength of these statements, some reason for thinking that their cause was not hopeless, and that they would not in fact have long to wait. In the crisis through which the empire was then passing, it seemed improbable that the Addington ministry

[3] It was printed in English and Irish newspapers about the middle of February, 1801. F. Plowden, *History of Ireland from the Union to 1810* (Dublin, 1811), I, 46.

[4] *Correspondence of Charles, First Marquis Cornwallis* (London, 1859), III, 347-348. Castlereagh, *op. cit.*, IV, 38-41, for dispatch on which this memorandum was based.

could long sustain the burden which it had undertaken; and Lord Fingal and his associates, in common with many others who were better informed than they, looked forward to Pitt's return to office within a comparatively short time and to the completion of his work. They were wrong, but the error was one which could hardly have been avoided.

Whether consciously or not, Lord Cornwallis had clearly minimized the difficulties of the situation, and had created in the minds of those who relied upon him an erroneous impression of Pitt's present attitude and of the course which he was likely to adopt in the future. He was himself convinced that the measure was "absolutely necessary for the preservation of the Empire;" and after the discussion of the past two years he had some grounds for supposing that Pitt and his colleagues held a similar opinion.[5] He had no direct communication from Pitt during these weeks, although the latter relied upon him to explain the action of his government and to prevent the Catholics from feeling that they had been deceived.[6] Castlereagh's dispatches detailing the development of the crisis at Westminster were not wholly free from ambiguity; and, situated as he was, it is not surprising that Cornwallis should have given them a more hopeful interpretation than was warranted by the facts. In any event, he could not have foreseen that within less than a month after this message had been given to the Catholic leaders, Pitt would not only have abandoned the measure, but would have given to George III a pledge which tied his hands for the remainder of the king's reign, and which aided greatly in postponing the settlement of the question far beyond that time.

Early in March, as soon as the king was sufficiently recovered from the mental illness from which he had been suffering for some weeks, a message was conveyed to him in which Pitt promised to refrain from bringing the subject of Catholic relief again before His Majesty's notice, and to oppose it by every means in his power, should it be in-

[5] Castlereagh, *op. cit.*, IV, 50.

[6] This was characteristic of Pitt's conduct during the whole Union negotiation. Cornwallis was the responsible head of his government in Ireland; yet Pitt constantly disregarded his advice in favor of that of Lord Clare, a violent and unscrupulous partisan whose object in supporting the Union was diametrically opposed to that of Pitt himself.

troduced by any one else; and to this promise was added shortly afterwards an intimation that, should the king desire it, he was prepared to withdraw his resignation and remain at his post.[7] The offer was declined. Addington's plans for taking office were far advanced, and the king was entirely satisfied with the change. Pitt resigned, and the impression created by Cornwallis' message was strengthened and confirmed.

For the misunderstanding which ensued, the responsibility rests with Pitt himself. He had seen and approved the dispatch sent by Castlereagh to Dublin.[8] He was fully aware of the text of the message given by the lord-lieutenant for circulation among the Irish Catholics and of the good results which it had produced;[9] and it is impossible to suppose that he could have failed to realise the patent contradiction between his secret proposal to the king and the pledge given more than three weeks earlier[10] by the representative of his government in Ireland, and communicated to a large number of persons who implicitly relied upon its accuracy.

The meaning which Pitt attached to Lord Cornwallis' message, and the action to be taken, should any action be necessary, were indi-

[7] The message was sent to the king through two channels: a verbal message through the king's physician, Dr. Willis, after the latter had reported to Pitt the king's conversation of March 6 (Willis to Pitt; Earl Stanhope, *Life of Rt. Hon. W. Pitt* [London, 1862], III, 304); and a letter from George Rose direct to the king (Right Honorable George Rose, *Diaries and Correspondence* [London, 1860], I, 360). Rose's letter is not dated, but it has been placed by his editor between two letters dated February 6, 1801. The date suggested by this placing of the letter is clearly incorrect. The king's illness did not begin until about February 20, and it was not for some days after that signs of mental derangement appeared. Rose, *op. cit.*, I, 311-32; Stanhope, *op. cit.*, III, 306.

[8] Castlereagh, *op. cit.*, IV, 41.

[9] *Ibid.*, IV, 77. Cf. also, Cooke to Castlereagh, March 3, 1801, *ibid.*, 70.

[10] This incident has been passed over very lightly by many of Pitt's biographers. J. H. Rose, *Pitt and the Great War*, says simply that "At the end of February, he, Pitt, authorised Castlereagh to send to Cornwallis at Dublin a declaration intended to reassure the Irish Catholics," p. 449. This is misleading. Castlereagh's dispatch is dated February 9; Cornwallis's message was delivered on February 13, and the lord-lieutenant wrote on the following day that "my advice and exhortation were perfectly well received." He added, however, that "any person must be of a sanguine turn of mind who can expect a calm of long duration." Castlereagh, *op. cit.*, IV, 49.

cated in a dispatch, written by Castlereagh, but evidently under the prime minister's direction, some time in February. He did not, of course, accept the lord-lieutenant's declaration as constituting anything like a binding pledge. With "the sentiments *generally* expressed in those papers" he was in agreement;[11] but as the precise terms in which the declaration was made had not been the subject of previous consultation, he declined to acknowledge any obligation upon himself or upon any of his colleagues, except in so far as "the papers in question were adopted by them in Parliament." It was obviously impossible for him to surrender his freedom of action, or to pledge himself never in any circumstances to re-enter the king's service, except on the conditions stated by Lord Cornwallis. "What his future conduct might be," it was stated, "would depend upon what he felt to be due to the question itself, as well as to the public interest."[12]

This explanation was intended for the guidance of Lord Cornwallis and presumably for that of other ministers, "in case the papers were alluded to in Parliament." But the papers were not alluded to in parliament. No occasion was ever given for a public statement; and Pitt's explanation, in itself just and reasonable, remained within the privacy of an official dispatch. What the Irish Catholics knew of his position was the simple statement set down in a document handed them by the head of the British government in Ireland, a document which in the circumstances they had some reason for regarding as an authorised declaration.

It was undoubtedly his sense of what was due to the public interest which induced Pitt, a few days later, to offer to remain in the king's service, and to employ all his powers to prevent any discussion of a question, the settlement of which he had until that moment regarded as essential to the success of the Union, the tranquility of Ireland, and the security of Great Britain itself. His motives will not be impugned; but the wisdom of surrendering his freedom of

[11] Italics in original.

[12] Text in Cornwallis, *Correspondence,* III, 346. Cf. also, MSS. in possession of J. B. Fortescue, Esq., at Dropmore. *Historical Manuscripts Commission, Report, 1892 to 1927,* VI, 458. Hereafter referred to as Dropmore Papers.

action, and of leaving to the absolute discretion of George III the settlement of a question upon which the very character of British rule in Ireland depended, may at least be doubted. His pledge to the king was entirely voluntary. George III took advantage of his position in a manner which is little to his credit; but he demanded no pledge, either from Pitt, or from the minister who replaced him. The practice begun a few years later of exacting such pledges from his ministers whenever his fears on this subject were aroused, must be attributed directly to Pitt's action at this time. The result was for long to be evident in the history of the Union to which Pitt had looked so confidently as the certain foundation of a new order in Ireland.

In the years that followed before Pitt's return to office the question attracted little public attention. The Catholics were broken, leaderless, and apathetic. The committee which had secured the passage of the Relief Act of 1793 had been dissolved; and no effort was made to revive it or to put anything in its place.[13] John Keogh and the other popular leaders who had been the strength of the Catholic organization at that time had ceased to take any part in public affairs; and in so far as the movement can be said to have had any direction during these years, that task devolved on men like Lord Fingal, Archbishop Troy, Lord Kenmare, and one or two of the lawyers who had recently been of service to government in marshalling Catholic support for the Union.[14]

They were not men of marked democratic sympathies. Their moderation bordered on timidity, and they were, except on this one question, scarcely less conservative than the ministers themselves. Popular interest in the question, which had been roused mainly by Keogh's Catholic Committee, and by the Society of United Irishmen during the preceding decade, had all but disappeared; and Lord Fingal and his associates, who somewhat ostentatiously styled themselves the natural leaders of the people, were not disposed to revive

[13] Thomas Wyse, *History of the Late Catholic Association* (Dublin, 1830), I, 135.

[14] One of these, Mr. Bellew, proposed that the Catholics should present an address to His Excellency, apologizing "for having been the occasion of so much mischief to their country as the loss of the services of the great personages who were retiring from administration." The offer was declined. Castlereagh, *op. cit.*, IV, 80.

it. They had been warned of the danger of any "unconstitutional conduct" on their part, and they interpreted this phrase in the widest possible sense. Their want of spirit and their readiness to comply with the demands of a government obviously bent on maintaining the "Ascendency" in all its power, have earned the censure of a later and more vigorous race of Irish nationalists; but their attitude was probably that of the majority of their co-religionists, at least of those who took any interest in the question.

In their anxiety to avoid anything that could give offense in high quarters, the Catholic leaders, during these years, sometimes went to almost absurd lengths. In August, 1803, the leading Catholics of Dublin prepared an address to His Majesty, intended to answer the charge, made by members of the Irish government, and given some credence even by the lord-lieutenant, that they were involved in the recent Emmett rising. Their expressions of loyalty were all that could be desired, but the address contained an oblique reference to the remaining penal laws, and to the desire of Irish Catholics "to participate in the enjoyment of the benefits of the constitution." This indelicate reference to a forbidden subject was disliked by Catholics in other parts of the country; and from Waterford and Kilkenny Lord Hardwicke received separate addresses, expressing loyalty and firm attachment to the constitution, but omitting all mention of their political disabilities.[15] Discretion could go no further.

Thus matters remained until Pitt returned to office in May, 1804. Even then the Catholics were in no haste, and several months elapsed before any action was taken. During that autumn a number of meetings were held in Dublin, sometimes at the home of Lord Fingal, the acknowledged leader of the movement, sometimes at that of James Ryan, a merchant parvenu, anxious to play a part in these great affairs; and for the first time since the Union the Catholics began to acquire something in the nature of an organization. They encountered difficulties at once. They were made aware of the disapprobation of the Irish government, and of its superiors at Westminster; but they were, of course, wholly ignorant of the actual conditions

[15] Hardwicke to Yorke, August 24, 1803. M. MacDonagh, *The Viceroy's Post-Bag* (London, 1905), p. 235.

under which the new administration had been formed and of the position in which Pitt himself was now placed.

That George III would demand a fresh guarantee from Pitt before again accepting his services was to be expected. The change of ministry occurred shortly after he had recovered from another attack of his mental illness, when his apprehension on this subject was more than ordinarily acute; and he was angered by Pitt's opposition to Addington, to whom, in his judgment, the nation owed so much. But he had no reason for anxiety. Pitt anticipated any demand that the king might have made by a simple and direct renewal of the assurance given in 1801 that, so far as it was in his power to prevent it, His Majesty would never again be disquieted by any reference to this subject. He regarded the Catholic question as "scarcely less deserving of attention" than the urgent problem of national defense which induced him to offer his services to the king, and to propose the formation of a national government, including the leaders of all the major political parties. But the undertaking which he had already given to the king precluded the possibility of any positive action; and his only recourse was to propose that the members of the new administration should pledge themselves, as he had done, to a policy of indefinite postponement.

"I need not repeat," he said in one of his first letters to the king:

> how fully my own determination has been formed to prevent his Majesty being ever disquieted for a movement, as far as depends upon me, by a renewal of the proposition which was in question three years ago respecting the extension of privileges to the Catholics; but I cannot help seeing that, although my own conduct under all circumstances is fixed, there may arise moments of difficulty in which, if this country remains divided by powerful parties, the agitation of this question may be productive of great inconvenience and embarrassment. The formation of such a system as I have supposed would, I conceive, among other advantages, effectually remove this source of anxiety, as I certainly can never suppose or wish it to be formed on any other ground but that of all those who might form part of the administration joining in the same determination with myself to endeavor to prevent the renewal of any such discussion.[16]

[16] Pitt to Eldon, May 2, 1804. Stanhope, *op. cit.*, IV, App., VI and VII. Eldon acted as intermediary between Pitt and the king in the early part of this negotiation.

Probably on no other conditions could Pitt have returned to office: and rightly or wrongly, he was convinced of the necessity of his doing so in the interests of national security. His letter was an invitation to George III to impose his own terms, and the wily old monarch took full advantage of his opportunity. He indignantly rejected the proposal that Fox should be included in the ministry; he forbade any further consultation with Lord Grenville and the group which he represented; and on the subject of the Catholic claims, he demanded a clear and specific guarantee. He condemned Pitt's proposal of 1801 as a dangerous scheme engineered by the enemies of the Established Church, some of whom, then holding high office, had too evidently "become followers of all the wild ideas of Mr. Burke;" and he insisted upon a pledge that Pitt would resist all efforts to alter the Test Act—"the Palladium of our Church Establishment"—or to secure further concessions for the Catholics.

The letter concluded:

> These points being understood, his Majesty was prepared to consider any eligible plan which Pitt might propose; "but should Mr. Pitt unfortunately find himself unable to undertake what is here proposed, the king will in that case call for the assistance of such men as are truly attached to our happy Constitution, and not seekers of improvement which to all dispassionate men must appear to tend to the destruction of that noble fabric which is the pride of all thinking minds and the envy of all foreign nations.[17]

The conditions were accepted. Pitt's dignified reply contrasts favorably with the king's malicious tirade; but his answer could hardly be in doubt. He reaffirmed his belief in the propriety of the measure which he had proposed in 1801, and in the salutary results which might have followed its enactment at that time; but he acknowledged that other considerations "and sentiments of deference to your Majesty" had convinced him of his duty to "abstain from again pressing that measure on your Majesty's consideration. The humble assurance of this determination on my part has been long since conveyed to your Majesty, and recently renewed; and to that assurance, without any addition or alteration, I must humbly beg leave to adhere."[18]

[17] Stanhope, *op. cit.*, IV, App., VIII-X.

[18] *Ibid.*, X-XII.

It was no more than Pitt had volunteered, and, as has recently been shown, it was wholly in accord with the political principles which had guided his conduct since the beginning of his public life.[19] But it was a unique victory for George III and a striking demonstration of the power which the crown still wielded.[20]

Pitt was allowed to resume his old office and to undertake the difficult task of organizing the country's defenses and finding allies for the coming struggle with Napoleon. His colleagues, with one or two exceptions, were titled mediocrities who owed their positions, less to their ability than to their readiness to support the king in defending the Church and the constitution against the designs of would-be innovators. From such a government the Irish Catholics could hope for nothing. With the exception of Pitt himself, Castlereagh and Dundas, now Viscount Melville, were the only members who could be regarded as friendly; and their attitude was at best somewhat dubious. The convinced advocates of emancipation, Fox, Grey, Fitzwilliam, Grenville, Spencer, and Windham, were excluded, not only by the king's veto on the Whig leader, but equally by the conditions proposed by Pitt himself for those who were to enter the ministry.

It was obvious that neither Fox nor Grenville, whose services Pitt professed to desire, would accept any such conditions. The latter had not abandoned his belief that "the removal of all the existing disqualifications" was necessary "to render the Union complete, and to derive from it all the advantages which it ought to offer to this country." He had retired from office in 1801, rather than remain in a position where he would be obliged "to resist in Parliament a measure which in our consciences we think so highly expedient;"[21] and it was unlikely, even in the circumstances of 1804, that he would return to office pledged in advance to resist this same measure.

Fox was not less determined. He had long been urging his party

[19] D. G. Barnes, *George III and William Pitt, 1783 to 1806* (Stanford, 1939), *passim*.

[20] S. Walpole, *Life of Rt. Hon. Spencer Perceval* (London, 1874), I, 139-140. Perceval who had been attorney-general under Addington, retained that office under Pitt. Cf. also, Redesdale to Abbott in Colchester, *op. cit.*, I, 511-512.

[21] Dropmore Papers, VI, 435-436.

to take up the cause of the Catholics, not merely because he believed that this might be "good in a party view," but equally as a matter of principle. It was important, he declared, in reply to the arguments of Sheridan and others who were opposed to stirring the question, to show "the Catholics that there are men of name at least in this country who espouse their cause," and to "teach them to look to other quarters than Bonaparte for redress." As early as November, 1803, he had consulted Grenville and Windham and had received from them an assurance of support. But the majority of the party were opposed. They feared to "exasperate the Orangeists," to "drive the Catholics to despair," and to give Pitt a fresh opportunity of ingratiating himself with the king.[22]

With evident reluctance Fox acquiesced in the decision of the majority; but he pointed out that such arguments tied their hands indefinitely, and deprived them of all means of effective "opposition to the Court;" and early in January, 1804, he returned to the attack. "That there should be a part of the United Kingdom," he wrote, "to which our laws nominally extend, and which is nevertheless in such a state as to call for martial law, etc., so repeatedly, is of itself ground for reconsidering at least the system by which it is governed."[23]

He did not persuade his followers. Most of them preferred the timid counsels of the Prince of Wales, who was rapidly shedding all signs of the liberalism which he had affected in his earlier life. Even from Grattan, whom he regularly consulted on Irish affairs, Fox got little encouragement. The Irish patriot leader, now retired from public life, considered that a debate on the Catholic question might be useful, if it were carefully managed; but he feared the effect of almost certain rejection of any liberal proposals by parliament, and he pointed out that, under existing conditions, a mere change in the law would be of little effect. "Legislative provisions are not enough. . . . Mr. Pitt lost the benefits of the Catholic Bill in 1793, because, after he had given the law to the Catholics, he gave the execution of the law, and the Catholics, to their enemies." What was required was a

[22] Lord John Russell, *Memorials and Correspondence of Charles James Fox* (London, 1857), III, 434-435.

[23] *Ibid.*, III, 448; IV, 14.

drastic change in the spirit and character of the executive government in Ireland; and there was little prospect of any such change.[24]

It is clear that Fox's mind was made up on this subject long before the exchange of correspondence with Pitt and Grenville, looking to the removal of Addington and the establishment of a coalition government; and in the course of that correspondence he took occasion to restate his convictions in clear and simple terms. "The inclination of my mind," he wrote, in a letter intended for Pitt's information, "is to think Catholic Emancipation absolutely necessary; but that I am willing to consider of the possibility of temporizing, whenever by a *full* knowledge of *all* the circumstances with which such temporising is proposed to be accompanied, I shall be enabled to give that question a fair consideration." He added, however, that the "concomitant circumstances must indeed be very favourable, to induce me to think even delay admissible in this business."[25]

The circumstance most likely to cause delay was the establishment of a regency; and in that event Fox agreed that it would be unreasonable to press the subject, if in the opinion of the regent, its discussion would be "likely to retard the returning health of his father." But he pointed out that, even if delay should be necessary, there were many measures, "a constant succession of measures" which were necessary, and which might for the present "operate as a substitute for the emancipation."[26]

Pitt had anticipated some of the difficulties in the way of his projected coalition. Some weeks before he opened negotiations with the king, he informed Dundas that, should His Majesty object to the inclusion of Fox and Grenville—a not unlikely contingency—he would drop that part of the plan and form a government from among his own friends, "united with the most capable and unexceptionable persons of the present government."[27] He does not seem to have considered

[24] *Memoirs of the Life and Times of Rt. Hon. Henry Grattan.* By his son, Henry Grattan (London, 1846), V, 239, 242-243.

[25] Fox to Grenville, April 20, 1804; Russell, *op. cit.*, IV, 46. Italics in original.

[26] *Ibid.*, IV, 47. Fox suggested that the first step should be the dismissal of Redesdale from his office of lord chancellor of Ireland.

[27] Pitt to Dundas, March 29, 1804. Stanhope, *op. cit.*, IV, 143.

the possibility that the Whig leaders might themselves object to the conditions which he planned to impose on them. The one point on which he was firm was that Addington himself must go; and to that the king reluctantly acceeded. But the retirement was brief. In December Addington returned as a member of Pitt's cabinet, bringing the needed support of some forty or fifty votes in the House of Commons. It had become necessary, as he explained, "to congregate into a firm and active body all those whose general principles are the same, and who are zealously disposed to protect the prerogative and to promote the personal comfort of the king."[28] The necessity which so impressed Addington arose in large measure from the activity of the Irish Catholics and their friends among the Whig leaders.

The meetings of Catholic representatives in Dublin caused some concern to Lord Hardwicke and the British government; and during the autumn of 1804 efforts were made to induce them to abandon their plan of petitioning parliament, and to await a more favorable moment for presenting their case.[29] Lord Fingal, who was consulted by the lord-lieutenant, was ready to comply with the request; and there were others only less influential who were equally desirous of avoiding anything that might prove a source of difficulty or embarrassment to Pitt's government. Among these, Denys Scully, a Catholic barrister whose pamphlets on the penal code had already attracted some attention, was the most important. He urged his co-religionists to remember the respect that was due the minister for "his enlarged and manly conceptions of the necessity of relieving them, and the dignified energy" of his public statements on the question. During the summer and autumn he had several interviews with the chief secretary, to whom he reported the proceedings of the Catholic

[28] Hon. G. Pellew, *Life and Correspondence of Rt. Hon. Viscount Sidmouth* (London, 1847), III, 238. Addington was raised to the peerage as Viscount Sidmouth.

[29] Cf, Lord Hawkesbury's explanation during the debate on the petition, May 20, 1805. Hansard, *Parliamentary Debates*, 3rd Series, IV, 673. Cf. also, Plowden, *op. cit.*, II, 24. Fox was aware of the efforts of the chief secretary to stop the petition, and he was evidently anxious lest Lord Fingal might yield to official persuasion. Fox to Windham, November 24, 1804; *Windham Papers*, edited by Lord Rosebury (London, 1913), II, 244.

Committee, and from whom he probably obtained some idea of the difficult position in which Pitt was placed.[30]

Neither Fingal nor Scully was prepared for a policy of indefinite postponement; but they were anxious to retain Pitt's favor, and they were evidently impressed by what they had learned of the situation in their conversations with the heads of the Irish government. Most of their associates, however, were less acquiescent; and at a meeting in Dublin on February 16, 1805, they adopted a petition praying for the removal of all remaining disqualifications, and named a deputation to present it to Mr. Pitt, with a request that he should lay it before the House of Commons. The petition was signed by ninety-eight laymen,[31] including all the Catholic peers and representatives of the landed gentry and the mercantile and professional classes. Among the signatures was that of the rising young barrister Daniel O'Connell.

The deputation arrived in London early in March, and after consulting Lord Castlereagh, Fox, and one or two of the more liberal Irish members, they were received by Pitt at his residence in Downing Street on the twelfth of that month. The result was what had been foreseen. Castlereagh had warned them that the moment was inopportune, that the ministry could not carry a relief bill, even with the help of the opposition, that the coronation oath was still regarded by many as an insuperable objection, and that discussion of the subject at the present time would be of no benefit to any one. Pitt took the same ground. He received the delegates with every mark of courtesy and consideration. He agreed that the proposed measure would be "very salutary, whenever the proper time should arrive;" but he informed them, not only that he must decline to present their petition himself, but that, under existing conditions, he must oppose it, should it be introduced by any other member.

Such an issue had been foreseen by the committee in Dublin. The delegates had been instructed, in case of refusal by Pitt, to seek the aid of another member; and in the circumstances, Fox was the obvious alternative. But Lords Fingal and Kenmare were reluctant to

[30] For Scully's relations with the chief secretary, cf. Colchester, *op. cit.*, I, 541.

[31] The clergy took no part in this.

abandon the hope of Pitt's support, which they had cherished for the past five years. The Catholics, said Kenmare, "looked to him as their patron, and they would cling to him and His Majesty's government as long as they possibly could." Rather than forego the advantage of even the most shadowy form of ministerial approval, they would have been content that he should introduce the petition, and simply lay it on the table, with a statement that the petitioners did not ask for immediate legislation. But Pitt's decision was already taken, and from that decision he would not be moved. He dismissed his visitors with the same courtesy with which he had received them, but he left them in no doubt as to the course that he would adopt.[32]

That ended the curious "understanding" between Pitt and the Irish Catholics, which had lasted for about a dozen years. It was a simple business arrangement—terms unstated, but sufficiently understood on both sides; and from it both parties had derived some advantage. The Catholics had obtained the Relief Act of 1793 and state endowment for the seminary at Maynooth; and on the other side, Catholic support had materially aided the British government in making the Union acceptable to a large proportion of the Irish people. That Pitt had been unable to fulfill the obligation incurred through this latter transaction was for him a cause of real regret; but his attitude towards this whole question must be clearly understood.

For Catholic Emancipation as a matter of principle, involving at once the questions of religious liberty and true representation of the Irish people in parliament, Pitt had neither interest nor sympathy. He regarded this, as he regarded most other issues particularly in domestic politics, quite simply as a matter of expediency. His policy throughout the whole controversy was stated in a letter to Lord Westmoreland in November, 1792, at a moment when the activity of the Catholic Convention and the possibility of their alliance with the United Irishmen were creating serious difficulties. "Firmness against violence," he said, ought to be "accompanied by symptoms of a disposition to conciliate," and the Catholics should be attached to the government "by holding out at least the possibility of future conces-

[32] *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 3rd Series (1908), pp. 7-14. From the diary of Scully, a member of the deputation.

sions in return for a perseverance in peaceable and loyal conduct."[33] Under the conditions prevailing in Great Britain and in Ireland during these years, that may have been a wise or a necessary policy, although its results can hardly be said to have justified it. But it was not to be expected that the Catholics would wait indefinitely for the possibility to become a reality, or would be content forever to leave the interpretation of loyal and peaceable conduct to men like Redesdale, Addington, and others, who were resolved that no concessions should be granted at any time or under any circumstances. Pitt's rejection of their very reasonable request left them with the alternative of dropping their project altogether, or of seeking the aid of the opposition leaders. Not unnaturally they chose the latter.

Fox eagerly welcomed the opportunity, and Lord Grenville supported him without hesitation. But their followers were less enthusiastic. A vote on the question would almost certainly have given a majority in favor of deferment, at least for a year, probably for a longer period. As a party the Whigs were still saddled with the incubus of an alliance with the Prince of Wales; and too many of those who regarded themselves as liberals in this reactionary parliament were anxious at all costs to avoid anything that could give offense to their princely patron. His opposition to any discussion of this question had become extreme, and the Whigs were warned "that in persisting, you will make the future possessor of the Crown as adverse to it as the present."[34] But Fox persisted, and in the end he had his way. The Whigs, largely through his influence, declined to surrender their freedom to the prince, as Pitt had surrendered his to the king; and that was a fact of some importance for the future.

Fox's action in bringing on the Catholic question at this time has been regarded by many writers as a mere party manoeuvre, prompted by a desire to embarrass Pitt.[35] That he would not, in the circumstances, be unduly solicitous about the comfort and convenience of his great rival may readily be admitted; but the conclusion accepted by so many of Pitt's apologists, that this was his only motive seems

[33] Pitt to Westmoreland, November 10, 1792, cited in W. E. H. Lecky, *History of Ireland in the Eighteenth Century* (London, 1919), III, 127.

[34] Dropmore Papers, VII, 268.

[35] J. H. Rose, *Pitt and the Great War*, p. 519.

untenable. "That which is my opinion now," he wrote to Windham in the spring of 1805, when the Whigs were wavering on the question, "has invariably been my opinion for the last four years." He had, he said, come into this parliament with some reluctance, and mainly for the purpose of pleading the cause of the Catholics. "The putting off of this question from session to session," he concluded, "has been a constant source of uneasiness and self-dissatisfaction for me;"[36] and in the light of his correspondence on the subject with Grey, Grattan, and other members of the party, there seems no sufficient reason for doubting the sincerity of the statement.

The debates on the petition, which engaged both houses of parliament for about two days in May, 1805, have attracted little notice, even among those writers who have made the history of Ireland their particular study.[37] The result was a foregone conclusion, and the discussion was in some respects hardly more than a postscript to the Union debates. Yet, even regarded in that light, it was a significant debate. It concerned a question upon which the Union itself depended; it gave to the members of the United Parliament their first opportunity of seriously considering the purpose of the Union, and the place to be assigned under it to the mass of the Irish people; and the opinions expressed on these subjects by the men who were to be responsible for the government of the United Kingdom during the next quarter of a century cannot be dismissed as of no importance.

The debates were conducted, on the whole, with great moderation. Lord Redesdale, Lord Sidmouth, and Dr. Duigennan, a slightly ludicrous henchman of the Irish government, who aspired to the role of Protestant champion vacated by the late Lord Clare, indulged in some violent abuse of the petitioners and of the religion which they professed. But these outbursts were evidently not to the taste of the average member in either house; and the example was followed by very few. The weight of debating power was with the advocates

[36] *Windham Papers,* II, 254.

[37] Rt. Hon. Sir James O'Connor, *History of Ireland, 1798 to 1924* (London, 1926), I, 164. Here the subject is dismissed in about a dozen lines, which contain little beyond a reference to Pitt and Grattan, a comment on a speech by the Archbishop of Canterbury, and an inaccurate statement on the voting of the Irish peers. Cf. also, Denis Gwynn, *Struggle for Catholic Emancipation* (London, 1928), pp. 136 ff.

of emancipation. The speeches of Fox and Grattan, pleading for the rights of a dependent people, are not unworthy of comparison with the finest efforts of Burke and Chatham on behalf of the American colonies. But debating power counted for nothing in a contest where the decision had been taken before the protagonists entered the lists.

The arguments in support of the petition turned, in the main, on three points: on the right of the Irish Catholics to what Fox called "complete parity with the rest of their fellow citizens;" on the disastrous moral effects of perpetuating among the Irish people a division "based on a false standard of merit," and one which had led to so much discord and violence in the past; and on what Lord Grenville described as the obligation resting on the imperial parliament to "redeem the pledge given by the Union."

Fox placed the question squarely on the ground of rights. The petitioners, he said, claimed nothing that was not in accord with the true spirit of English law. "Equality of rights," he declared, "is one of the principles dearest to the human heart, and it is one which the laws of Great Britain, to their immortal glory, sanction." He described these remaining penal laws as contrary to every principle of liberty. The arguments by which they were defended were of a character to justify the most degrading tyranny, and to defeat every purpose of free government and their practical results were disastrous. While conferring no benefit of any kind upon the state they served "to deprive of their rights one-fourth of his Majesty's subjects, and to place them in a state which must greatly embarrass the power and resources of the Empire."

The consideration which influenced Pitt during this whole controversy, and which in fact determined the form of his government in 1804, Fox regarded as wholly inadmissible. He said:

> It would be a great and incalculable evil, were it to be established as a maxim in this house that no person must move any measure, however great its benefits might be, if it were once whispered about that it could not be successful, because another branch of the constitution was hostile to it. I could wish to see any sacrifice made for the gratification of the crown, except the sacrifice of the well-being and security of the country.[38]

[38] *Hansard*, 3rd Series, IV, 844-852.

Strong support was given by Grattan, who had entered the House of Commons a few days earlier, and by several Irish members, who declared that they had voted for the Union chiefly with a view to facilitating the settlement of this question and bringing some measure of peace and internal unity to Ireland.[39] Grattan spoke at length of the evils of a system which put a premium on sectarian animosty; a system which "enabled men without religion and without moral or political integrity to obtain credit and consequence" by parading their hostility to a large body of their fellow citizens; and he warned the house, with prophetic vision, that a union interpreted in this illiberal spirit was doomed. "When the parliament of Ireland rejected the Catholic petition and assented to the calumnies then uttered against the Catholic body, on that day she voted the Union. If you should adopt a similar conduct, on that day you will vote the separation."[40]

In the upper house the debate followed a similar course. Lord Grenville described Catholic Emancipation as an essential part of the Union; not a simple matter of granting or withholding certain privileges from a small number of His Majesty's subjects, but "a great and national question, upon which the peace and unity of the Empire might eventually depend." He dismissed the question of a pledge supposed to have been given to the Catholic leaders as of no importance. "The expectations which the Catholics entertained, and which they were justified in entertaining, arose," he said, "not from any assurances given by persons authorised or unauthorised, but from the nature of the subject itself." The Union he regarded as absolutely necessary; but its value would be sacrificed if its benefits were withheld from so large a part of the Irish people. That settlement, so far only partial in its operation, had imposed on the imperial parliament "the duty of providing in the most effectual manner for the real and essential union of all the inhabitants of this kingdom, not in government and policy and law only, but in interests, in affection, in devotion to the maintenance of the Constitution." That was an ideal not easily to be attained. The first step was the admission of Cath-

[39] *Ibid.*, IV, 954, 1027, and 1039.

[40] *Ibid.*, IV, 924-937.

olics to the constitution which they were called upon to support and to defend.[41]

Grenville's ablest supporter was Lord Hutchinson, a liberal Irish peer, whose plea for the rights of his countrymen was marked by the same generosity and good sense that distinguished the speeches of Grattan, William Smith, Ponsonby, and some other Irish members in the House of Commons. Sooner or later, he declared, these laws must be repealed and the Catholics admitted to the rights of citizenship; and what must be done eventually had better be done at once and with the best grace. In its present form the Union had accomplished very little. It had failed to touch the real evils in Irish society. What was required, and urgently required, was a settlement that would put an end to the internal divisions in Ireland, a settlement that would be in truth "the commencement of a new era, when men may forget the prejudices of the sectarian and recollect the duties of the citizen." Without that, he concluded, "union by act of parliament" would bring neither peace to Ireland, nor strength and security to Great Britain.[42]

With the exception of Lord Redesdale, whose curious maunderings were dismissed by the Duke of Ormond as a collection of old womens' stories, the only member of the Irish government who took part in the debate was the chancellor of the exchequer, John Foster. Foster was a man of great ability, formerly speaker of the Irish House of Commons, an ally of the late Lord Clare, and one of those upon whom Pitt's government had chiefly relied until the eve of the Act of Union. Like Clare, he had been distinguished during the whole of his public life for his implacable opposition to any concession to the Catholics. Unlike Clare, he had been equally determined in his opposition to the Union. Since the Union he had taken little part in public life; but one of Pitt's first acts on resuming office was to appoint him to the important post which he now held. He had lost none of his old rancor and none of his determination to uphold the Protestant Ascendency in its entirety.

The object of this petition, he said, was simply political power. To accede to its demands would settle nothing. Its sponsors were a few ambitious men, who could not be content until they had erected the

[41] *Ibid.*, IV, 652-660.
[42] *Ibid.*, IV, 769.

Catholic Church on the ruins of the Protestant. To admit these men to parliament would be to endanger the Union and to break faith with the Protestant people of Ireland. "Remember," he declared, "that you have settled us in Ireland under the faith of that protection; that on that faith we claim as our inheritance all the blessings of that glorious constitution which our ancestors and yours have fought and bled for—a Protestant King, Protestant Councillors, Protestant Lords and Protestant Commons. This is Protestant Ascendency in the true sense of the phrase, and while I can utter my voice in this house, I will demand it for my country."[43]

With such ideas Pitt, of course, had no sympathy; and more than once during his brief statement he took occasion clearly to dissociate himself from the fears and prejudices of his more reactionary followers. His speech betrayed the difficulties of his position; and his emphatic declaration that "he came to the discussion of this question perfectly free and unfettered," could have carried little conviction. He made no serious effort to meet the arguments of Fox and Grattan. Probably, he agreed with most of what they said. But his surrender to the king had forced him to adopt a purely negative attitude, and he limited himself to the repetition in various forms of one general idea. "If from other circumstances, there were no objections," he said, "the admission of a certain number of Catholics into the Imperial Parliament, under proper guard and conditions," would be unlikely to produce "any effects detrimental or injurious to the welfare of the state or the safety and security of the Constitution." But he insisted that, in the absence of any "general concurrence of sentiment" in favor of the change, the experiment would be hazardous; and he threw the weight of his influence against the petition and against the proposal to continue the discussion in committee.[44]

That was Pitt's last statement on the subject. The men who were to follow him in the leadership of the Tory party had more definite views. To men like Spencer Perceval and Lord Hawkesbury, two future prime ministers, and to Redesdale and Abbott, the acknowl-

[43] *Ibid.*, IV, 1004. The Earl of Limerick, Lord Carlton, and Lord Redesdale also described the Union as a "Protestant compact," which would be violated by admitting Catholics to parliament. *Ibid.*, 715, 723, 727.

[44] *Speeches of Rt. Hon. W. Pitt* (London, 1817), II, 421-425.

edged authorities in this group on all Irish questions, this problem presented itself in much simpler terms. The objects of the Catholics, wrote Abbott in a warning message to Lord Hardwicke, are "limited to a few points, though not very inconsiderable. They desire merely the revenues of the Established Church and of all lay property now in the hands of Protestants in Ireland, and separation from Great Britain to enable them to keep these possessions." These are the opinions, he added, "upon which every man holding them ought to act without reserve."[45] And it was upon these opinions, or something very like them, that the reactionaries took their stand.

Of these the home secretary, Lord Hawkesbury, was the most important. His office made him chiefly responsible for the government of Ireland, and he explained that he had done all in his power to prevent the petition from being presented at this time. But his opposition to the Catholic claims, he declared, was based on larger grounds. "Though I think the present time peculiarly unfavourable; though I am of opinion that the circumstances growing out of that time would of themselves furnish a sufficient ground for resisting this proposition; yet my objection rests not on the time only, but is applicable to any time and to any circumstances under which this subject can be brought forward." The discussion did not, in his opinion, concern either the loyalty of the Catholics or the problem of religious toleration. The question was simply "whether you will grant them political power of every description at the time when they refuse to acknowledge the complete authority of the state."[46]

The petition was rejected by large majorities in both houses.[47] Not all the members who opposed it held opinions so extreme as those of Lord Hawkesbury; but no one in that assembly was destined to a longer tenure of power, or was to exercise greater influence on British policy in Ireland; and to the end of his life Hawkesbury did not deviate from the views expressed in this debate. His principal coadjutor in 1805 was the attorney-general, Spencer Perceval. Perceval had made it a condition of serving under Pitt that he should be

[45] Colchester, *op. cit.*, I, 492.

[46] *Hansard*, IV, 673-674; 679-680. Hawkesbury was later Earl of Liverpool.

[47] The vote in the Commons was 336 to 124; in the Lords, 178 to 49.

free to oppose the claims of the Catholics on principles that would be applicable at all times and under all circumstances; and his brief, confused statement in debate was little more than an affirmation of this principle.[48] In succession these two men held the highest office in the British government for eighteen of the most critical years in the history of the Union; and with George III and Pitt they share responsibility for giving to it an interpretation so narrow and illiberal as to defeat the very purpose for which it was enacted.

Much has been written of the pledge supposed to have been given to the Catholics in 1800; but the question is of relatively little importance. Emancipation was necessary, as the most liberal of Pitt's former colleagues pointed out, because "it is by that measure alone that the great union of Protestant and Catholic can be brought about."[49] The same point was made more clearly by a liberal Ulsterman. "By introducing some Irish Catholics into this house," he observed, "misconceptions would be mutually removed, and asperities gradually softened down. We should come to know each other better and might expect to reap at a much earlier period the advantages of a substantial union, intimate and complete."[50] That would appear an eminently reasonable view. It had the merit, too, of being strictly in accord with the policy adumbrated by the statesmen who framed the Union in 1800. But the Tory majority of 1805 preferred the reasoning of Foster and Hawkesbury, or at least they were content to follow Pitt's lead and defer to the judgment of George III.

On no point had Pitt placed greater emphasis in his speeches on the Union than on the need of establishing honest, impartial authority in Ireland. On no subject had he been more eloquent than on the evils of racial and sectarian division, which the Irish parliament, by its very composition, was unable to end. Everyone who reflects on the subject, he said, concluding an exhaustive survey of the ills of Irish society, "must agree with me in thinking that there is no cure but in the formation of a general imperial legislature, free alike from terror and from resentment, removed from the danger and agitation, uninfluenced by the prejudices, and uninflamed by the passions of that dis-

[48] *Hansard,* IV, 943.

[49] William Windham, *Hansard,* IV, 1022.

[50] William Smith, *Ibid.,* IV, 956.

tracted country."[51] In 1805 these arguments were forgotten. The wisdom of the Irish parliament in excluding Catholics from every species of political power became for Lord Hawkesbury the light by which the policy of the united parliament must be guided. To depart from that policy would be to violate the spirit of the Union. "We are bound in justice and good faith," he declared, "not to repeal those laws, unless some unforeseen circumstances and great necessity should compel us to have recourse to such repeal."[52] There was no such necessity in 1805, but that necessity was certain to arise; and by their sentence of perpetual exclusion, Lord Hawkesbury and his followers were doing their best to create the very situation which they feared, when it would be necessary to repeal those laws, and to repeal them under conditions the least favorable to the success of the Union and the strength and stability of British rule in Ireland.

DONALD J. MCDOUGALL

University of Toronto

[51] *Speeches of Rt. Hon. W. Pitt*, III, 46.
[52] *Hansard*, IV, 690.

THE PAPACY AND THE SCOTTISH WAR OF INDEPENDENCE

THE close connection of Scottish nationalism and Scottish religious life is frequently regarded as having come into its own only at the time of the Reformation. Such, however, is not the case. As early as the fourteenth century Scottish national feeling found its greatest support in the Scottish Church. The nobles, both greater and lesser, were usually willing to accept English bribes and to submit to English domination. It was the bishops and the clergy, on the other hand, who were determined to maintain national independence. Fearful lest they should be brought under the control of the Archbishop of York, they were strongly opposed to any submission to England. Such an attitude had its influence upon the Scottish nobility, who in turn became more nationalistic. But what is even more important for our present study, this nationalism had a very real effect upon Scottish relations with the Papacy. Indeed, the Scottish War of Independence (1296-1328) actually brought Scotland's relations with Rome almost to the breaking point during the first quarter of the fourteenth century.

Until the Scottish War of Independence, the national church outside its own country had been of comparatively little importance. The country was too rough, the people too lawless, and the revenues too small to tempt papal dependents. For this reason, the offices and benefices of the Church were largely filled by Scots themselves. The personnel of the Church, therefore, instead of being international in complexion as in some other countries, was strongly Scottish. Yet, at the same time, there was actually little unity of feeling. As there was no Scottish metropolitan, each bishop was directly responsible to the Pope. The only indication that the Scottish Church was more than a mere conglomeration of bishoprics, and that it had some national entity, was given by the papal bull of 1225 authorizing the convocation of a Scottish provincial council. Provision was made for this body by Pope Honorius III in order that the Scottish clergy might hold a provincial synod in accordance with the decrees of the Fourth Lateran Council. As the Scots refused to attend the synod

of York, a Scottish synod was the only alternative. This body, however, had little power. Shackled effectively by both king and Pope it was merely deliberative. Nevertheless, it was the first recognition of the Church's national unity; and as such it had its psychological importance. From 1275 to 1500, however, it was little more than a name, and as such, it accomplished little or nothing.[1]

Outside of Scotland, the papal curia and the English Church were the only two bodies with which the Scottish clergy had anything approaching intimate relations. With Rome were maintained the usual contacts made up of appeals of the usual variety and the consecration of bishops.[2] With the English clergy, on the other hand, especially with those of the Archdiocese of York, Scottish ecclesiastical relations were none too cordial. As the Archbishops of York were continually asserting their primacy over Scotland, they did not tend to endear themselves to their northern neighbors. In fact, these claims were a continual source of trouble, as the Scots flatly refused to submit to any English prelate. To this was added Scottish irritation at the English Church's support of all attempts made to bring Scotland under the English crown. Then to cap it all, English prelates were notorious in Scotland for their oppression of the Scottish border. In this matter, the Bishop of Durham had a particularly bad reputation. There was thus no love lost between the two national churches, the attitude of the English clergy serving only to stimulate Scottish ecclesiastical nationalism.[3]

This was the general attitude of the Scottish clergy when in March, 1286, King Alexander III died. His sudden demise without male heir was to test the national feeling of the Scottish clergy. Moreover, it was to prove that neither the Papacy nor the English Church could look for Scottish ecclesiastical support in any policies which might curtail full national independence. While some of the nobles might

[1] A. R. MacEwen, *A History of the Church of Scotland*, 2nd ed. (London, 1915), I, 237-243; D. Patrick, *Statutes of the Scottish Church, 1225-1559*, pp. xxxi, ff.

[2] *Calendar of Papal Registers* (London, 1893), I, *passim*, hereafter cited as *C. P. R.*; MacEwen, *op. cit.*, I, 243.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 256.

submit, the clergy were too determined to maintain their independence of English ecclesiastical control.

As the nearest heir to the throne, Margaret, daughter of King Eric of Norway, was not in the country when Alexander died, the nobles and clergy chose a board of six guardians to govern until her arrival. Of the six men named two were ecclesiastics, William Fraser, Bishop of St. Andrews, and Robert Wishart, Bishop of Glasgow. For three years this body ruled the country in the absence of the queen.[4] As such an arrangement, however, was clearly unsatisfactory, in 1289 four commissioners: Bruce of Annandale, Comyn of Badenoch, and the two bishop-guardians were sent to England to discuss the country's future with Edward I. As a result of considerable negotiations by these ambassadors, the Treaty of Brigham was signed (1289). It was arranged that Margaret should come to Scotland, where she would later marry as consort the Prince of Wales. If this plan had been carried out, it might have resulted in the union of the two crowns, a consummation apparently favored by the Scots' commissioners. Yet while the two bishops favored political union, they were determined that this would not mean the ecclesiastical subordination of Scotland to England. To prevent such a disaster, they had a clause inserted in the treaty guaranteeing the absolute independence of the Scottish Church from English control. The treaty was then ratified by forty-six Scottish churchmen and sixty earls and barons.[5] It came to nothing, however, as on her way to Scotland Margaret died in Orkney.

The death of the Maid of Norway left Scotland with an exceedingly complicated problem of succession. To help unravel it, Bishop Fraser of St. Andrews favored calling in Edward of England. Fraser seems to have supported the claims of John Balliol and felt that Edward might be persuaded to concur. He therefore gave his adherence

[4] Andrew of Wyntoun, *The Original Chronicle*, edited by F. J. Amours (Scottish Tract Society, 1907), V, 157; P. F. Tytler, *History of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1864), I, 24.

[5] P. H. Brown, *History of Scotland* (Cambridge, 1900), I, 134; T. Rymer, *Foedera et Acta Publica* (Hague, 1745), I, 3, 50, 70; Tytler, *op. cit.*, I, 26. Edward had obtained a dispensation for the marriage even before preliminary negotiations were completed.

to the plan of inviting Edward to be arbiter with the result that the Scots approached the wily English king.[6] Some historians have accused Fraser of lack of patriotism in his demand for Edward, but whatever his motive, his plan worked. Without unseemly haste Edward agreed to arbitrate. But he had no sooner signified his agreement than he laid down a condition. The Scots must acknowledge him as liege lord. After some demur this was granted; and Edward then proceeded to adjudicate on the claims of the various aspirants to the crown. Within a short time all but two claimants, John Balliol and Robert Bruce, were eliminated. In 1291, therefore, a meeting was called at Upsettlington to decide which was to be king. Each man was represented by forty commissioners. But Balliol had the support of Fraser of St. Andrews and most of the higher clergy, while Bruce was favored by only the Bishop of Dunkeld and the Abbots of Melrose and Jedburgh and the lower clergy. Most of the nobles followed Fraser's lead and stood for Balliol. Edward, however, was determined that whoever was king would also be his vassal. He therefore waited until he had received papal confirmation of his claim to suzerainty over Scotland; then he declared Balliol to be the rightful monarch. It looked as though Scotland was henceforth to be nothing more than a relatively unimportant part of Edward's dominions.[7]

Balliol, although chosen by Edward and acknowledging his suzerainty, did not long enjoy his royal estate. Trouble arose between the two kings, for Edward desired to rule Scotland with an iron hand. Under these circumstances Balliol, becoming disgusted with his position, began to look across the sea to his other neighbor, France. Thither in 1295 he sent ambassadors who succeeded in negotiating a treaty of amity and confederacy between the two countries. Edward Balliol, the Scottish king's son, was to marry Charles of Valois's daughter, and the countries were to support each other in war.[8] This beginning of the "auld alliance," however, did not last long. Edward took swift measures to counteract Balliol's alliance by capturing

[6] John of Fordun, *Chronicle of the Scottish Nation*, edited by W. F. Skene (Edinburgh, 1872), p. 307; Tytler, *op. cit.*, I, 30.

[7] *Foedera*, I, 3, 93-115; Tytler, *op. cit.*, I, 32 ff.; Wyntoun, *op. cit.*, p. 164.

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 266; *Inventaire chronologique des documents relatifs à l'histoire d'Ecosse* (Abbotsford Club, 1839), p. 7; Tytler, *op. cit.*, I, 39 ff.

Berwick and routing the Scots at Dunbar (1296). Following these Scottish reverses, Balliol repented of his ways, renounced the French alliance, and renewed his allegiance to Edward. On the same day, July 10, 1296, Comyn, Earl of Buchan did the same; and shortly afterwards the Bishops of Glasgow, Aberdeen, and Candida Casa along with many of the nobles and other clergy likewise acknowledged Edward as liege lord. Balliol was then removed from the throne because of his display of independence. It was more than Edward could permit. The country was to be ruled by a commission of three Englishmen. With the apparent consent of all, Edward was the absolute ruler of Scotland.[9]

The English king, however, does not seem to have been satisfied with this bloodless victory. Scottish nationalism had to be undermined. This meant that the Church would have to lose its anti-English bias. The Scottish clergy had already shown that they did not favor submission to English control. On this account, Edward apparently attempted to anglicize the Scottish Church by introducing English clergy into Scottish ecclesiastical benefices whenever possible. In this he was partially successful, but at the same time he was preparing for his own eventual defeat. The Scottish clergy were roused to oppose the policy, and in this way started in the direction of active revolt against English domination.[10]

The resentment against the English clergy had begun even while Bishop Fraser, one of the Scottish ambassadors to France in 1296, was still out of the country. His two surrogates, William of Kinghorn and Patrick of Campania, in April, 1296, ejected all English clergy from the Diocese of St. Andrews. They declared that the Englishmen were aiding and abetting Edward's political pretensions in Scotland. Within a short time, this action was imitated by the other Scottish bishops. All the English clergy were forced to return home. The *Liber Pluscardensis* gives a long list of the ejectees, stating that Fraser was the one responsible. Hollinshead, on the other hand, makes Wallace the instrument of removal and places his action in the following year. The latter historian may have made a mistake in the

[9] *Foedera*, I, 3, 160, 161, 164, 166; Wyntoun, *op. cit.*, p. 293; *Invent. Chron.*, pp. 9, 10.

[10] A. M. MacKenzie, *Robert Bruce, King of Scots* (London, 1934), p. 92.

year, or it may have been that Wallace simply completed the process of removal. But whoever was responsible, the English clergy were ejected for nationalistic reasons.[11] Edward's attempt at propaganda through the Church had failed.

In May, 1297, this was emphasized when revolt against English rule broke into flame after William Wallace's attack upon Lanark. Wallace had little support from the Scottish nobles as they were either in English pay or in English prisons. Among the latter was Wishart, Bishop of Glasgow, who had been captured after the defeat at Dunbar. But as soon as he could gain his freedom he hastened to join Wallace. In this he was soon followed by a number of others.[12] Equally important as Wishart's help was the fact that there now occurred an opportunity to appoint a Wallace supporter to the bishopric of St. Andrews. In September, 1297, Fraser had died, and once that rather compromising individual was out of the way, the diocese might be given to a strong nationalist. This was done when Wallace obtained the election of Wishart's chancellor, William Lamberton. Lamberton was chosen in spite of the Comyns, and, of course, against Edward's desires. Moreover, the Balliol party did not like him as he favored Bruce for the crown. Comyn actually went so far as to protest to the Pope, complaining that he had not been admitted to the election. Boniface VIII, however, accepted Lamberton. The result was that St. Andrews gained a bishop who was to be a tower of strength to the nationalist cause.[13]

Lamberton's accession, on the other hand, helped to widen the breach already created between Wallace and many of the barons. The result was that the latter deserted Wallace, thus ensuring his defeat at Falkirk. Wallace was so disgusted and disheartened by such treacherous conduct that he resigned the office of Guard-

[11] Fordun, *op. cit.*, p. 318; *Liber Pluscardensis* (Edinburgh, 1871), I, 148 f; R. Hollinshead, *The Scottish Chronicle* (Arbroath, 1805), I, 421; *Statutes*, p. xxxvii f.

[12] Wyntoun, *op. cit.*, pp. 299 ff; *Chronicon de Lanercost* (Maitland Club, 1839), p. 190, hereafter cited as *Lanercost;* MacKenzie, *op. cit.*, p. 93.

[13] J. F. S. Gordon, *Ecclesiastical Chronicle for Scotland* (Glasgow, 1867), I, 175; J. Dowden, *The Bishops of Scotland* (Glasgow, 1912), pp. 21-23; Wyntoun, *op. cit.*, p. 310; J. Stevenson (Ed.), *Documents Illustrative of the History of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1870), II, 280; *C. P. R.*, I, 576.

ian of the Realm. Henceforth he was to exercise little political influence in the country except indirectly through Lamberton. In his place were appointed two governors, John Comyn, Lord of Badenoch, and John of Soulis, who were to carry on the administration of the realm. The choice of governors was made by the Pope who had been asked by the Scots to aid in their choice. To this plea Pope Boniface acceded and his legate made the final decision. Thus the Papacy at least indirectly gave its support to Scottish claims to independence from English rule.[14]

Despite his recognition of Scottish autonomy, however, the Pope did not succeed in keeping Edward from interfering with that country. In an attempt to organize a crusade, during July, 1298, he had written to Edward urging him to come to terms with France and Scotland, her ally. This plea for a cessation of hostilities was repeated in the following January. At last, in July, the Pope was successful, or at least partially so. France and England agreed to a truce. Scotland, however, although an ally of France, was left out of the picture. Since there was little real hope that Edward could ever subdue France, he was willing to make peace with her. But Scotland was a different matter. Without a king, and divided into various warring factions, it seemed that the Scots must eventually submit. Edward, therefore, paid scant attention to the Pope's demands that he leave Scotland alone.[15]

At this point Pope Boniface took an extremely strong stand on the subject of Scottish independence. In the spring of 1299 John of Soulis, one of the guardians, sent William, Archdeacon of Lothian, Baldred Bisset, and William of Eglisham to Rome. They were instructed to request the Pope to make Edward stay out of Scotland. Boniface replied by sending orders to the English king, instructing him to remove from Scotland all his officials and representatives. He then went on to state that the English had no rights in Scotland, as that land was directly subject to the Papacy. Yet Boniface was not

[14] Brown, *op. cit.*, I, 120; Wyntoun, *op. cit.*, pp. 315 ff; *Chronicle of the Kings of Scotland* (Maitland Club, 1830), p. 63.

[15] J. Bain, *Documents Relating to Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1884), II, 255; A. Potthast, *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum* (Berlin, 1875), II, 1981, 1998; Wyntoun, *op. cit.*, p. 323; *Foedera*, I, 3, 205, 209.

rash. Explaining that he did not wish to be unjust, he asked that six proctors be sent to Rome in order that he might decide who was Scotland's suzerain. As his relations with France were at this point none too cordial, he could not afford to offend England by being unnecessarily abrupt or dogmatic. Nevertheless, he continued to assert his authority over the Scottish kingdom. There was no doubt, he maintained, that the rule over Scotland pertained to the head of the Roman Church.[16] On the following day, the Pope sent another letter to Edward ordering him to release the Bishops of Glasgow and Sodor, who, he heard, were his prisoners. A similar letter was also sent to the Archbishop of Canterbury.[17]

That Edward set little store by Pope Boniface's claims, is shown not only by his treaty with France in 1299, but also by the fact that he did not reply to the Pope for over a year. When he did, however, he set forth in no uncertain terms his claims to the Scottish throne. Going as far back in history as Brutus, the son of Aeneas, he produced every possible argument. To all these reasonings of Edward, Baldred Bisset made answer before the Pope in a manner that was perfectly satisfactory—at least to the Scots.[18] But Edward was not convinced. Therefore, he proceeded with his plans to accomplish the final subjugation of the rebellious nation.

Meanwhile, Boniface also tried to obtain the release of John Balliol, the ex-Scottish king. When the truce between England and France had been ratified in 1299, one of the provisions dealt with the disposal of the person of Balliol. On the request of Boniface himself, it was decided that he should be placed at the disposal of the Pope. This may have been an attempt on the part of the Pope to free the only recognized ruler of Scotland from Edward's control. Balliol was apparently only too glad to co-operate for, on July 18, 1299, he signed a notarial instrument giving the Pope disposal of his person. He was then sent to his own lands in the south of France. There he was kept more or less as a prisoner under ecclesiastical

[16] *Ibid.*, pp. 209-10; *C. P. R.*, I, 584; Wyntoun, *op. cit.*, pp. 322 ff; Fordun, *op. cit.*, p. 325; *Liber Pluscard.*, p. 164. Cf. Horace K. Mann, *The Lives of the Popes in the Middle Ages* (London and St. Louis, 1932), XVIII, 250 ff.

[17] *Ibid.*, pp. 160, 165; *C. P. R.*, I, 185; *Cal. Docs. re Scotland*, II, 271.

[18] *Lib. Pluscard.*, pp. 166, 205; *Foedera*, I, 4, 6, 9.

supervision. To all intents and purposes he was no longer King of Scotland.[19]

Yet in spite of all Boniface's claims, and his assertions of suzerainty over Scotland, his enthusiasm for this distant fief began to wane. The reason for this would seem to lie in the fact that he was having trouble with Scotland's ally, France. Although as a result of papal efforts, England, Scotland, and France signed the Treaty of Amiens in January, 1302, two weeks later the French publicly burned the papal bull *Ausculta Fili.* This commenced a struggle between the Pope and Philip IV of France in which each sought for allies. When the definitive treaty of peace was signed the next year France was willing to sacrifice Scotland to Edward, by having her excluded. The Pope, on the other hand, had been equally ready to obtain Edward's aid by changing his attitude towards Scottish independence.[20] Indeed, by 1302, Pope Boniface's situation had become so uncomfortable that he was willing to forego all his claims. This was made startlingly clear in a letter which he addressed to Bishop Wishart and others of the Scots' clergy. He charged them with stirring up trouble between England and Scotland; and accused Wishart of being the leader of the movement. The clergy were ordered to cease their anti-English propaganda and activities immediately, on pain of his displeasure. Papal policy was now completely reversed.[21]

Two months later Boniface VIII died as a result of the treatment he received from French soldiers at Anagni. Henceforth the Papacy would find it increasingly necessary to give its support to English policies.[22] Scotland, on the other hand, deserted now by both France and the Papacy, was faced with the overwhelming power of Edward. From a political point of view at least, it looked as though Scotland was doomed to extinction as a separate country. Moreover, the clergy would either have to submit to English domination, or would

[19] *Ibid.*, I, 3, 210 ff; *Invent. Chron.*, p. 19; Thomas Gray, *Scalacronica* (Maitland Club, 1836), p. 125; *Chron. Lanercost,* p. 193; *Docs. Illust. Scot. Hist.*, pp. 382, 420; N. Trivet, *Annales* (London, 1845), p. 376.

[20] *Invent. Chron.*, p. 20; *Foedera,* I, 4, 13 f, 24; D. Schaff, *History of the Christian Church* (New York, 1924), V, 2, 15 ff.

[21] *Foedera,* I, 4, 17; *C. P. R.*, I, 602, 603; Tytler, *op. cit.*, p. 74.

[22] Schaff, *op. cit.*, V, 2, 44 ff.

have to ignore papal demands and support more strongly than ever, the national cause.

As a result of this situation, Edward prepared with complete confidence to settle the Scottish question once and for all. In February, 1304, he occupied Stirling, where he captured the two governors, Comyn and Soulis, along with other leaders such as the Bishops of Glasgow and Sodor. By this success the country was deprived at one blow of many of its leaders, while others such as Lamberton, thought that it would be politic to submit. Yet while acknowledging Edward's suzerainty, Lamberton also signed a band of alliance and mutual aid with Robert Bruce, Earl of Carrick.[23] Both apparently hoped that some day resistance to England might be possible. Yet this band did not hinder them from acting, in the meantime, along with a number of other Scots, as Edward's advisors on the government of Scotland.[24] Set up in 1304, this advisory body was a symbol of England's complete victory. Further evidence of this was given in the following year by the execution of William Wallace. For the time being at least, Edward was supreme north of the Tweed.

Even the Papacy was willing to accept the *fait accompli*. Clement V, who before his elevation to the papal see had been Archbishop of Bordeaux within the domains of the English king, accepted without question his claims to Scotland. In February, 1306, he confirmed the election of Forcard as Bishop of Caithness; and as was customary the ruler of the country was notified. This ruler was Edward of England, who was given also all the other usual acknowledgements of his claims to sovereignty over the Scots.[25] The change of policy commenced by Boniface shortly before his death was now complete. Henceforth, Scottish nationalism could count the Papacy one of its enemies.

Yet while the Pope recognized Edward's claims, the Scots were by no means as acquiescent. Just when everything looked most favorable for Edward, trouble started. Robert Bruce, as well as entering into an alliance with Lamberton, had an understanding with the Red

[23] H. Maxwell, *Robert the Bruce* (New York, 1901), p. 120; *Docs. Re Scotland*, II, nos. 1529-1531.

[24] *Ibid.*, II, nos. 1420 ff, 1745, 1817, 1818; MacKenzie, *op. cit.*, p. 138.

[25] *C. P. R.*, II, 8 ff; MacKenzie, *op. cit.*, p. 169.

Comyn of Badenoch. For some time the two nobles carried on a correspondence which was supposedly secret. Comyn, however, was revealing to Edward everything written him by Bruce. The outcome of this treachery was that Bruce had to flee the English court in order to save his life. But only when he arrived in Scotland did he find out the full extent of Comyn's double-dealing. To discuss the matter the two men met in February, 1306, before the altar of the chapel in the Minorite convent in Dumfries. An altercation which soon became a fight, was the result, and Comyn and two of his followers were killed. Bruce thus commenced his work of freeing Scotland by an act of flagrant sacrilege.[26] This would not help Scotland to gain papal favor in the coming struggle, but such a thought seems to have worried Bruce very little.

As little as Bruce's act of sacrilege worried him, it had no more effect upon the Scottish clergy. Soon after Comyn's death, Bruce had a conference with Bishop Wishart, but recently released from an English prison, who presented him with the Scottish royal standard, and absolved him for his act of blood. Both Leslie and Hollinshead say that the Pope did likewise at this time, but there is no evidence that such was the case. Following Wishart's acceptance of Bruce, the latter was crowned at Scone on Palm Sunday, 1306. The Abbot of Scone and the Bishops of St. Andrews, Glasgow, and Moray performed the ceremony. By this action they issued a defiance to both Edward and the Pope. It was a denial of Edward's suzerainty over Scotland and also a rejection of the Pope's decision in favor of the English king's claims. The bishops followed their coronation of Bruce by an equally drastic step. They proceeded to raise the country against the "southrons," declaring that it was as meritorious to fight the Englishmen as it was to fight Saracens. The leaders of the Church had thrown in their lot completely with the nationalist cause.[27]

Such actions as these, the Pope could not permit to go unnoticed.

[26] John Barbour, *The Bruce*, edited by W. W. Skeat (Scottish Tract Society, 1894), I, 20-27; *Docs. Re Scotland*, I, no. 1747; Tytler, *op. cit.*, I, 86 ff.

[27] Barbour, *op. cit.*, I, 29-34; Hollinshead, *op. cit.*, p. 431; Johne Leslie, *Historie of Scotland*, edited by J. Dalrymple (Scottish Tract Society, 1895), II, 1; MacEwen, *op. cit.*, p. 255; Matthew of Westminster, *Flowers of History*, edited by C. D. Yonge (London, 1853), II, 584.

In March he had excommunicated the Bishop of Moray for rebellion, and on May 10, 1306, he suspended Wishart from his spiritual functions and his temporal possessions. Two days later he instructed the Archbishop of York to seize the Bishop of Glasgow and incarcerate him. But this was only the beginning. On June 5, Bruce was formally declared excommunicated.[28] The Pope had given his support to the anti-Scottish group.

The actions of the Pope, however, could have little effect, unless Edward subdued the country, or unless the Scottish clergy were willing to submit to papal commands. The latter alternative was never really possible as the rank and file of the Scottish clergy were rather indifferent to the whole affair, while the bishops were strongly nationalistic. It remained, therefore, with Edward to make effective the papal excommunication. On the outbreak of the rebellion he moved northwards to Cupar Castle which, along with its governor, Bishop Wishart, soon fell into his hands. By August, Lamberton and the Abbot of Scone had been added to Edward's collection of Scottish clergy. They were all sent to England. The Bishop of St. Andrews was not imprisoned for rebellion, but because he had sheltered James Douglas, one of Bruce's leaders. When Edward had secured the persons of these Scottish ecclesiastics he proceeded to take action against them before the papal curia. He accused them of perjury, irregularity, and rebellion, and demanded that they be punished.[29] Clement V, however, although a friend of Edward, seems to have done little about the matter. He was having his troubles elsewhere, particularly with France. Therefore, the matters of a small country such as Scotland were to a large extent ignored.

The next few years saw a continuation of this policy. While not entering into the controversy between England and Scotland, it was taken for granted at the curia that the English and Scottish churches were one. Papal nuncios were usually commissioned to England,

[28] *C. P. R.*, II, 6; *Docs. re Scot.*, II, no. 1906.

[29] *Scalacron*, p. 131; John Spottiswoode, *History of the Church of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1847), I, 103; *Foedera*, I, 4, 59, 60, 63; *Docs. re Scot.*, II, nos. 1827, 1828; Tytler, *op. cit.*, I, 94. Edward vainly tried to have Lamberton and Wishart removed in favor of his own nominees. C. Mollat, *Les Papes d'Avignon, 1305-1378* (Paris, 1930), pp. 273-277.

Scotland, Wales, and Ireland. Papal circular letters to the bishops of the two countries give the impression that they were all working harmoniously together. In August, 1308, for instance, we find the Bishops of London and Lincoln commissioned to collect the Holy Tenth in Scotland. They were to collect according to modern values, not those of times of peace. But it would seem that the bishops did not dare to fulfill so hazardous a task, for in June, 1309, the Bishop of Worcester and William Testa were appointed to collect these imposts. None, we are told, had been collected since the time of Pope Gregory X. In August, 1308, the English and Scottish bishops by the same letter were summoned to the Council of Vienne.[30] The Pope had obviously adopted the attitude that they all formed one Church. Thus it was only natural that they should be treated as one.

Meanwhile, it would seem, the nationalistic attitude of the bishops was beginning to have its influence among the lower clergy. In 1309, for the second time, Bruce was excommunicated. He was declared guilty of continuing in rebellion against Edward, after he had been commanded to desist. While this action of the Pope may have been taken with the intention of weakening Bruce's cause, it had an opposite effect. When the Scottish Provincial Council met at Dundee in the following year, the clergy expressed their complete loyalty to Bruce. They declared that they would support him despite his excommunication.[31] What is more, any cleric who did not favor the national cause found his position somewhat trying. One of the anglophiles, the rector of Suthremokedy in the Diocese of St. Andrews, could not come near his parish unless supported by an English army. In this way the Scottish Church virtually severed official relations with the rest of Christendom. Moreover, while they did not cease entirely, Scottish official contacts with the Papacy decreased almost to the vanishing point. Although between 1312 and 1316 Papal nuncios frequently came to England, none seemed to have attempted to go to Scotland. During the same period, about the only matters referred to the Pope from this rebellious land were requests

[30] *C. P. R.*, II, 32, 43, 48, 49, 64.

[31] MacEwen, *op. cit.*, p. 258; *Lanercost*, p. 213; Brown, *op. cit.*, I, 127; *Acts of the Parliament of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1844), I, 100.

for dispensations to marry within prohibited degrees.[32] The Scots were prepared to maintain their independence even in opposition to the Papacy.

While they had been resisting the Pope, the Scots had also been successfully opposing Edward. From 1310 to 1314 the fighting had continued somewhat spasmodically. In 1314 came the Battle of Bannockburn, the turning point of the war. From then on Scottish independence was assured. Wishart was released as a result of the Scottish victory, and it would seem that peace might now be expected. The Scots, however, were determined to fight the matter to a finish. England must recognize Scotland as an independent nation. With this in view they kept up hostilities, now returning the English visits across the borders. In May, 1316, an especially great expedition was organized. The Archbishop of York excommunicated all those taking part, but they gave little heed to the archiepiscopal thunders. An appeal was then made to the Pope who threatened them with the interdict. By this time, however, the Scots had returned home laden with loot.[33]

Although from the military point of view, the Scots were now in sight of victory, from the ecclesiastical vantage point the situation was not so hopeful. In September, 1316, Pope John XXII announced to the Scots his election. But this information gave them little encouragement. A Frenchman from the fiefs of Edward of England, there was little hope that the new Pope would give them any more help than had Clement V. Moreover, as John XXII was not infrequently in trouble with either France or the Holy Roman Empire, he was usually desirous of maintaining good relations with England. He could not, therefore, be expected to help free Scotland from the English menace.[34]

Yet despite the probability that Pope John would support England, he was more realistic than his predecessor. In 1316, for the first time since 1312, he sent a papal nuncio to Scotland. What happened to him we are not told. Then on March 15, 1317, two more nuncios,

[32] *C. P. R.*, II, 91, 116 *et passim.*

[33] *Lib. Pluscard.*, I, 231; Fordun, *op. cit.*, II, 339; Barbour, *op. cit.*, I, bk. xiii; *Lanercost*, p. 232; MacKenzie, *op. cit.*, pp. 282, 300.

[34] *C. P. R.*, II, 126.

Cardinals Gaucelin and Luke were appointed. They were instructed to work for peace, and were to enforce all leagues. At the same time, the Pope wrote them a letter of a more intimate character instructing them to force Bruce to come to terms. If he remained obdurate, they were to release all Bruce's subjects from their oaths of allegiance; and to proceed against him and his followers on charges of sacrilege since they had been guilty of burning churches. One cannot but be surprised that the murder of Comyn was omitted at this point. Finally, the cardinals were to promote the idea of a crusade in which Bruce was to take part. On the following day, the Pope dispatched to the king a letter informing him that the two cardinals were coming to make peace. But any hope that Bruce would be amenable to papal intervention was destroyed by John XXII's refusal to acknowledge him as King of Scots. He was addressed as "the noble man now governing Scotland," the Pope expressing the hope that the lack of the royal title would not be taken amiss. This letter virtually ended the mission before it started.[35]

Before the departure of the embassy from Avignon, however, the Pope took other action which only added to his unpopularity and assured the failure of his attempt to obtain peace. A few days after his letter had been sent to Bruce, he dispatched one to the Bishops of Norwich and Ely. Edward Bruce, Robert's brother, was at that time leading a Scottish expedition to Ireland against the English; so the Pope instructed the bishops to warn Bruce against occupying land in England, Wales, and Ireland. Any and all alliances or combinations formed by the adherents of Bruce were also to be dissolved. At the same time a mandate was sent to the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of Winchester permitting them to excommunicate all nobles fighting against the king, or attacking his domains. Bruce, of course, would be included in this, as he was in the Pope's eyes still virtually an English vassal.[36]

Such actions on the part of the Pope would not prejudice the Scots in his favor. But in May he went even farther. He instructed the two nuncios preparing to leave for Scotland to force Edward II and "Bruce, self-styled king of Scotland," to sign a two-year truce.

[35] *C. P. R.*, II, 126, 129, 130, 131, 420, 427; *Foedera*, I, 1, 108 ff.

[36] *C. P. R.*, II, 138, 139.

Whoever broke it would be immediately excommunicated. In the following month, letters were also sent to the clergy, nobles, and people of Scotland, urging them to forward this work of the cardinals. At the same time, Pope John tended to turn all classes against him by instructing the emissaries to enforce procurations, and by granting them authority to provide to practically any benefice in England, Ireland, and Scotland. About the same time he also gave notice that he had reserved to himself the right to fill the See of Glasgow.[37] This policy of papal interference was not popular among the nationalistic Scots, particularly the clergy.

The results of John's undiplomatic actions were soon made apparent. The cardinals did not go themselves to Scotland but instead sent representatives. Bruce flatly refused to accept letters which did not address him as King of Scots. Moreover, the wild Scottish borderers, probably on instructions from the king, treated the nuncios' representatives with scant courtesy, even going so far as to rob them and take away the papal letters. This action was followed in 1318 by the Estates re-affirming Scottish liberties, and even forbidding the sending of money to Rome for the acquisition of privileges.[38] Thus attempts to strengthen papal authority in Scotland had led only to an increase of anti-papal feeling.

In the meantime, while the Pope was trying to bring peace, the English and Scots had been carrying on desultory warfare. In the spring of 1319, however, Edward II prepared for what he hoped would be the final blow at Scotland. To help him, Pope John sent him £2500 from the Crusading Fund. He also wrote to the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London, instructing them to exhort all the English clergy to pay promptly to Edward, the tithe of one year's proceeds of all benefices. This money had been granted him by the Pope for the defence of the realm. Yet in spite of all papal measures, of help, Edward failed to capture Berwick and was obliged to retire to England.[39] Shortly afterwards, Edward sought and obtained from the Scots a two years' truce.

[37] *Ibid.*, II, 127, 128, 130, 131, 132; MacEwen, *op. cit.*, p. 265; *Foedera*, II, 1, 124, 127, 131.

[38] *Foedera*, II, 1, 131, 134, 151; Tytler, *op. cit.*, I, 131, 132; *A. P. S.*, I, 105.

[39] MacKenzie, *op. cit.*, p. 302; *C. P. R.*, II, 185, 191, 425.

While peace was at least temporarily established between England and Scotland, the Papacy and the Scots were by no means reconciled. As a result of the treatment accorded their messengers, the cardinals had excommunicated the Scots. This act was followed by a papal communication to the Bishops of St. Andrews, Dunkeld, Aberdeen, and Moray. As Bruce had rejected papal efforts at mediation as well as a letter sent to him by special envoy, not later than May 1, 1320, they were to appear at Avignon to explain the Scots' conduct. The Pope apparently regarded the bishops as the backbone of the movement opposing Edward II and himself. At the same time the papal envoys were instructed to absolve all Bruce's subjects from their allegiance; and in January, 1320, the Bishops of London and Carlisle were ordered to excommunicate Robert Bruce, Earl of Carrick. The reason given for this sentence was his murder of John and Robert Comyn in the church of the Minorite Friars at Dumfries. The bishops of England were also given the authority to publish the excommunication of any invaders of the realm. This, of course, included any Scottish expeditions.[40] By these means the Pope hoped to bring the Scots to submission.

Along with these measures, the Pope proceeded to summon the recalcitrant Scottish leader to Avignon. He even sent the king a safe-conduct to facilitate his journey. Bruce, however, would make no sign of submission. Instead he laid the whole matter before the Estates which met at Arbroath on April 6, 1320. This body replied by sending a petition to the Pope requesting his favor. They pointed out the unjust and sacrilegious deeds of the English, and closed by declaring that they would never submit to Edward. This was a polite but direct defiance of the Pope. The Scots' communication reached Rome some time in August, and immediately brought a change in papal policy. Although Bruce and his clerical supporters had in July been excommunicated as contumacious, Pope John suspended the sentence until April, 1321. At the same time letters were dispatched to the King of England, urging him to come to terms with Bruce. As a result the earlier two years' truce was renewed between the countries, and negotiations were commenced with the hope of

[40] *Ibid.*, II, 191, 192.

bringing a permanent peace. But as continental matters were now becoming very important, the negotiations dragged on ineffectively.[41]

So matters continued until 1322. By that time the Anglo-Scottish truce had expired. Edward II now decided to bring the struggle to a final end by establishing peace through the use of the sword. The result of this attempt was a defeat almost as great as that which the English suffered at Bannockburn. The Scots broke across the border, defeated the English, and plundered to their hearts' content. This opened a period of war which lasted for some years longer. Although Edward II was removed from the throne in 1327, the English tried to continue the struggle until Scotland was subdued. By 1328, however, they had enough of fighting for a time and were willing to accept peace.

The Pope during this period made his greatest efforts to gain a peace which would be favorable to the English. In 1322 he sent a legate to Scotland demanding that the Scots cease their raiding of the English border. But since Bruce was not recognized as king, he would have nothing to do with the papal message. The legate, therefore, laid the country under an interdict and departed. The following year another papal attempt was made to bring peace, but nothing came of it, as the Pope did not recognize Scottish independence. The Scots, instead, made a treaty of alliance with France, who entered the lists against England in 1324. The Scots were willing to carry on the struggle indefinitely, particularly since they had obtained France as an ally.[42]

Meanwhile ecclesiastical affairs in Scotland were going on much as usual, despite the interdict. The Pope either ignored or forgot his own judgment against the Scots, for in 1322 the Abbott of Inchaffray, after some litigation at the curia, had been confirmed as Bishop of Dunblane. This is the more surprising as the new bishop had taken part in Bruce's coronation, and had blessed the Scots before Bannockburn. We find, too, that papal reservations of benefices continued to be made throughout the country during this period.[43]

[41] *A. P. S.*, I, 114; *Lib. Pluscard.*, pp. 201-205; Sir Jas. Balfour, *Historical Works* (Edinburgh, 1824), I, 98; *C. P. R.*, II, 192, 199; *Lanercost*, p. 240.

[42] Tytler, *op. cit.*, I, 143 ff; Barbour, *op. cit.*, II, 77 ff.

[43] MacEwen, *op. cit.*, p. 365; *C. P. R.*, II, 222 ff.

But in spite of the lightness of the interdict, the Scots did not like it. Consequently in 1324 they asked for its removal. Pope John, however, refused unless the Scots handed Berwick back to the English and recognized Edward's suzerainty.[44] The Pope's unequivocal support of the English claims did not bring about their acceptance. The Scots were winning, and could afford to wait.

Despite the apparent hopelessness of trying to gain papal favor, the Scots turned to the French for aid. In the renewal of the Franco-Scottish alliance in 1325, the French promised to endeavor to have the Pope remove the interdict.[45] But this was impossible as long as the war with England continued. Papal favor could not be successfully sought until peace had been made with the "auld enemy." And this was not far off. In March, 1327, the English began to make overtures for peace but without much success. As they were in desperate need of a truce, however, negotiations were reopened in the autumn of the same year. It was then comparatively easy for the Scots to obtain their desires. Edward III, but recently made king, recognized Scottish independence by giving up all claims to suzerainty over the country, and agreed to ask the Pope to show favor to Scotland. In accordance with this, two days later he wrote the Pope. Some time afterwards, in October, 1328, he went even further by ordering that all money withheld during the war from the Scottish incumbents of English benefices should be given to the rightful owners. At least for a time peace was restored.[46]

As a result of the good offices of the English king, Pope John XXII now released Bruce from excommunication and recognized him as King of Scots. The interdict was also removed and the Scots forgiven for their non-payment of dues owing to the Papacy. Finally, in November, Bruce's confessor was authorized to give him plenary remission at the hour of death. After almost a quarter of a century of conflict with the Papacy, Scotland was once more at peace with Rome.[47]

[44] Brown, *op. cit.*, I, 165; *Foedera*, II, 2, 146.

[45] Fordun, *op. cit.*, II, 343; *Invent. Chron.*, p. 22.

[46] *Foedera*, II, 2, 182, 185, 193, 198; II, 3, 6, 11, 28.

[47] *C. P. R.*, II, 283, 289; MacEwen, *op. cit.*, p. 264.

The importance of this episode in Scottish history, lies in the change which it brought about in the relation of the Church to the State. It forged a real link between the Scottish Church and Scottish nationalism. Always somewhat nationalistic in its outlook, the Scottish Church had usually shown its attitude in its opposition to English attempts to control it. With the War of Independence, however, the situation was altered. The Church was one of the main supports of a movement which had as its enemy, not only the king of England, but also the Papacy. The result was a union for good or ill, of the Church and Scottish nationalism. Out of this development came many of the problems which dominated Scottish history for many a year afterwards.

W. STANFORD REID

McGill University

MISCELLANY

Jehan Henry, Author of the Livre de Vie Active

Jehan Henry is a forgotten name in French history. La Croix du Maine[1] lists him simply as a canon and cantor of the Cathedral of Notre-Dame-de-Paris, who died in 1483, and was buried at Fontaine-lès-Meaux. Others have copied this, together with the names of a few of his published works.[2] Information about him in the obvious places is very scant. The only reference in the cartulary of the Cathedral of Notre-Dame is to be found in one of the obituaries, where the date of his death is given as February 2, 1483.[3] They have no record of his burial, and the only additional information included is a statement of an amount left by him to the cathedral for anniversary Masses for the repose of his soul, the money having been obtained by the church from a brother, Pierre Henry, precentor of the cathedral,[4] the only member of his family of whom any mention has been found. There is no complete list of his works, and the extent of his writings seems never to have been recognized in modern times.

On the other hand, we find that the catalogue of the Bibliothèque Nationale lists him as the author of at least eleven books published in the early years of the sixteenth century, within twenty-five years of his death. Several unpublished works have survived in manuscript. A search of various chronicles and letters of the last half of the fifteenth century shows that Jehan Henry was a person of some importance at the court of Louis XI, and possibly earlier, at that of Charles VII. He was on several occasions one of the canons of the cathedral assigned to the administration of the diocesan hospital, the Hôtel-Dieu of Paris. He was a writer of popular homilies for people of widely divergent social position, from a princess of the blood to the Poor Clares of Aigueperse in the Auvergne. His reputation as well as his books lived for some time after his death, but, unfortunately, both seem to have been forgotten in the course of the sixteenth century. His name appears in a number of unexpected and ob-

[1] La Croix du Maine et du Verdier, *Les bibliothèques françoises . . .*, Nouvelle edition, I (Paris, 1772), 520; IV, 443-444.

[2] U. Chevalier, *Répertoire des sources historiques du moyen âge: Bio-bibliographie*, I (Paris, 1871); *Nouvelle biographie générale*, XXIV (Paris, 1858), 206.

[3] B. E. C. Guérard, *Cartulaire de l'église Nôtre-Dame-de-Paris*, IV (Paris, 1850), 15.

[4] *Ibid.*, IV, 15.

scure places in published sources. Except for the manuscripts mentioned there is little likelihood that more could be found, although no further check of European archives is at present possible. A search of unindexed manuscripts would, of course, be impossible without more indications than we possess. Up to the present, such references to Jehan Henry as have been known, are so incomplete and scattered that it has not even been known whether they referred to a single individual. Our information now makes it clear that they do, although the case has been somewhat complicated by the discovery, in the course of this study, of another, and later Jehan Henry, who had not been known in this connection at all.

A seventeenth-century list of officials of the Parlement of Paris[5] states that Jehan Henry had become a member of that body, as counsellor, on May 10, 1454. This is the earliest date we have been able to find in connection with his life. There is reason to suspect that he had come to Paris from Evreux in Normandy. We know that he was at one time a canon of Evreux Cathedral, and Archdeacon of Ouche in that diocese, for there are inscriptions to that effect in two books which he gave to the cathedral library at Evreux. The addition of the date of his death to this record makes the identification complete.[6] It is unlikely at this date that Jehan

[5] Blanchard, *Catalogue de tous les conseillers au Parlement de Paris et Presidents a mortier au Parlement de Paris* (Paris, 1647), p. 23.

[6] One of these manuscripts is now in the Bibliothèque Nationale, *MS Latin 401*. It has been described by Deslisle, *Cabinet des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Impériale*, II (Paris, 1874), 83, as bearing the inscription "de dono Johannis Henrici archidiaconi de Otta et prebendati in presenti ecclesia qui obiit anno Domini 1483." The other manuscript, now at the Bibliothèque d'Evreux, has been described by Omont, *Catalogue générale des manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques des départments: Rouen . . .*, II (Paris, 1888), 452. On folio 322v we find essentially the same inscription, "de dono et legato scientifici viri magistri Johannis Henrici archidiaconi de Occa prebendati in presenti ecclesia, qui obiit a d 1483." We have been unable to examine the original manuscripts personally to determine whether the variations in spelling of the name of the archdeaconry are due to the original spelling, or to the interpretations of the two great palaeographers who examined and described the manuscripts in the works quoted above. Probably the second explanation is the valid one, as the letter *c* and *t* in the writing of this period are often indistinguishable from each other. All efforts to identify Occa or Otta, other than as Ouche, have failed. No other places suggested by the spelling have any connection with Evreux, and it seems almost certain that the place in question must have been in that diocese, although this was not at first apparent. Blosseville, *Dictionnaire Topographique de Département de l'Eure . . .* (Paris, 1877), p. 262, gives *Oca*, *Occa*, and *Ocha* as old forms of Ouche. Ouche, which we have been unable to find on modern maps, is described as "anc. doyenné rural de 44 paroisses, entre la Charentonne, la Resle et le Chemin-Perré, avec quelques extensions sur la

Henry held his two benefices at the same time, although this is not impossible. Unless he did, he must have been at Evreux before he came to Paris. And he may have held the Evreux benefice first, and kept it after acquiring one in Paris. There is another trace of him in the vicinity of Evreux at an unknown date. One of his books, the *Livre d'instruction pour religieuses novices et professes* . . . was dedicated to a Marie Gastarde, a novice in the convent of the Chaize-Dieu of the Order of Fontevrault. This house was the famous Notre-Dame-des-Hautes-Bruyères, near Evreux, but we have found no record of this nun, nor of her relationship to Jehan Henry.[7]

The first contemporary mention of Jehan Henry shows that he was a canon of Notre-Dame-de-Paris in 1459. On April 20 of that year, he sat as a member of a committee of the cathedral chapter, to deal with the case of a heretic who had been confined in the Hôtel-Dieu of Paris by order of the king. The man was a prisoner, and was in irons, and the committee seems to have been a board to investigate the several charges against him.[8]

In 1463, the name appears again, this time in a letter of Louis XI dated May 24 of that year, in which the king addressed the counsellors of the Parlement of Paris, including Henry, who was mentioned by name.[9] Thus by 1463, according to contemporary records, Jehan Henry was well established in Paris, in the Parlement of Paris, and in the cathedral chapter. If we may rely on Blanchard's catalogue, it may be concluded that he had been there for nine years or more. Two years later, in 1465, the War of Public Weal broke out, and a group of the peers of France, together with the Duc de Berry, brother of the king, formed a coalition against Louis XI. Jehan Henry now appeared in a new capacity. Together with the chancellor, de Morvilliers, and one Pierre Sallat, he was sent by Louis XI on a mission to the cities of the Somme, where he was to tell the people of Amiens of the "treason of the Duc de Berry and warn them against him."[10]

---

rive droite de la Reste," and as "Ouche, archidiaconné de l'anc. dio. d'Evreux . . ." (p. 160). One of the manuscripts referred to is a composition of Nicholas of Lyre, Lyre being another of the old archdeaconries of Evreux, and therefore of local interest at Evreux.

[7] Religieuses de Sainte-Marie de Fontevrault de Boulaur, *Histoire de l'Ordre de Fontevrault, 1100-1907,* II (Auch, 1913), 10-11.

[8] Deliberations of the Chapter of Notre-Dame, transcribed from Archives Nationales *MS LL 222,* by Coyècque, *L'Hôtel-Dieu de Paris,* II (Paris, 1891), 146, items 980-981.

[9] Vaesen et Charavay, *Lettres de Louis XI,* II (Paris, Société de l'histoire de France, 1885), 120.

[10] *Lettres de Louis XI,* II, 230-239.

In 1467 he was appointed cantor,[11] a position carrying with it a certain dignity and responsibility in the cathedral chapter, as well as an extra salary. We have an undated letter of Louis XI assigning to Jehan Henry a supplementary salary of sixty pounds per year. This may have been the order for his salary as cantor, as the amount is the same as that assigned under similar circumstances to dignities of Louis' pilgrimage church at Cléry.[12] Henry evidently kept this office for the rest of his life. The only well-known contemporary reference to him, a document of the year 1481,[13] contains his name as cantor of Notre-Dame. We have found several other references to his position, in the letters of Louis XI, and in the notes of the editors of these letters, as well as in the records of the Hôtel-Dieu of Paris.[14] These records show that he was cantor in 1472, 1482, and at the time of his death.

Somehow or other, then, Jehan Henry came from Evreux or some unknown place, to Paris, prior to 1454, and quickly rose to positions of importance in both Church and State. He was not only a dignitary of the cathedral and a counsellor in the parlement, but he had attracted the attention of the king, and had acted as his ambassador on at least one occasion. How did this come to pass? Possibly he was the kind of person who made himself known very quickly, with an ingratiating, impressive personality. More likely, and perhaps in addition, he was the protégé of some important churchman, who was himself the protégé of the king. The name of Jean Balue suggests itself, for he was a favorite of Louis XI and the protégé of the king's chamberlain, Charles de Melun.[15] Balue was Bishop of Evreux from 1462 to 1465, when he was transferred to Angers. If he had had a prior connection with Evreux, he may have known Jehan Henry there, and he may also have come to know him later, and have influenced the king in his favor after 1462.

Jehan Henry held another position of importance. He was on several occasions a member of a board which administered the affairs of the diocesan hospital. This board was appointed annually by the cathedral

[11] This appointment is quoted by Coyècque, *op. cit.*, I, 16, from Archives Nationales *MSS LL 114, 224, 360, 538*, unfortunately all inaccessible at present.

[12] *Lettres de Louis XI*, X, 456; *Ordonnances des rois de France*, XVIII (Paris, 1828), 438.

[13] A contract concerning the Abbot of Saint Victor and the monks of his monastery. *Gallia Christiana*, VII (Paris, 1744), 135-136.

[14] *Lettres de Louis XI*, 120, VII, 299, quoting Archives Nationales *MS LL 121*; L. Brièle, *Collection des documents pour servir à l'histoire des hôpitaux*, III (Paris, 1881 ff), 75; Guérard, *Cartulaire de Notre-Dame*, IV, 15.

[15] Bernard de Mandrot (Ed.), *Journal de Jean de Roye, connu sous le nom de Chronique Scandaleuse*, I (Paris, 1896), Société de l'Histoire de France, 40, note.

chapter, the dean being a member *ex-officio*. Jehan Henry was a member of this board from June 25, 1471, to June 25, 1479, and again for some months prior to his death.[16] This position was by no means a sinecure, for members of the board were responsible for a great many details, much as the resident director would be in the modern counterpart of this mediaeval hospital. The life and duties of the staff, the religious services, the records and accounts, were only a few of their many responsibilities.[17]

Henry seems also to have continued in his temporal positions until his death, rising in rank in at least one of these. In 1478, his name appears in the records of a suit in parlement, giving him the title *président des enquêtes,* instead of counsellor. There is a record, probably contemporary, of his having purchased estates in Vitry, near Paris, in 1470, and the titles *président aux enquêtes,* and *chanoine d'Evreux* appear on this document.[18] Curiously, although we know that he was still a member of the parlement in 1482,[19] there is a question about his membership in the previous year. In the *Nouvelle biographie générale*[20] it has been pointed out that in the Saint-Victor contract of 1481[21] Jehan Henry appears with the title of cantor and no other, while another official, who came from the cathedral of Orléans, but was also a member of the Parlement of Paris, used his title of counsellor in the contract. It has been deduced from this that Jehan Henry had become a member of the parlement only after 1481.[22] As we have seen from the references mentioned above,[23] his membership in the parlement began in 1454, and he was a member still in 1463. He was again mentioned as a member in 1482, when he was one of a committee of five to deal with an important prisoner.[24] The omission of his title from the Saint-Victor contract of 1481 was doubtless accidental, and Henry may thus be considered to have kept his status throughout the last thirty years of his life.

According to the cartulary of Notre-Dame, Jehan Henry died on Feb-

[16] Coyècque, *op. cit.*, I, 16, quoting Archives Nationales *MS LL 144, 224, 227, 206, 360, 568.*

[17] *Ibid.*, I, 26, note 3, II, 144, items 968-969; Brièle et Coyècque, *Archives de l'Hôtel-Dieu de Paris.* (Collection des documents inédits sur l'histoire de France) [Paris, 1894], p. 24, Item 54.

[18] *Lettres de Louis XI,* VII, 299; Lebeuf, *Histoire de la ville . . . de Paris,* IV (Paris, 1883), 453.

[19] *Lettres de Louis XI,* X, 351-352.

[20] *Nouvelle biographie générale,* XXIV, 206.

[21] Cf. above, note 13.

[22] *Nouvelle biographie générale,* XXIV, 206; La Croix du Maine, *op. cit.*, I, 520; IV, 443-444.

[23] Cf. Notes 5 and 9 above.

[24] *Lettres de Louis XI,* X, 351-352.

ruary 2, 1483.[25] This date is given in connection with his donations to the Cathedral of Evreux, and it is inscribed in the manuscript of one of his unpublished works, the Livre de Vie Active,[26] a document which for centuries was considered the greatest manuscript treasure of the Hôtel-Dieu of Paris. The editors of the *Nouvelle biographie générale*,[27] pointed out that if he had died on that date, he must have been only Jehan Henry, cantor of Notre-Dame, and not the Henry, member of the parlement. They cited a document used by Félibien[28] which showed that the Henry who was a member of the parlement, was still alive on February 7, 1483. This document dealt with a well-known episode, the illness of the king, and the date is, therefore, not questionable. In 1483, Louis XI, who had been ill since his apoplectic stroke two years earlier, occupied himself with all sorts of efforts to obtain a miraculous cure. He persuaded the Pope to send precious relics from the Vatican, including supposed pieces of the skin of St. Anthony of Padua. The king himself had the most sacred relics sent from Reims, and these were kept by him in Paris, and then sent on to him at Tours. In February, 1484, his suffering increased, he thought as a result of the continuous north wind, so he asked the Parlement of Paris to arrange a religious procession from Paris to Saint-Denis, to intercede with heaven for an abatement of the wind. The procession was organized, and Jehan Henry was one of those who took part in it.[29]

The procession took place on February 7, and if Jehan Henry had died on the second of that month, he could not have taken part in it. Coyècque, editor of the Hôtel-Dieu manuscripts, was aware of this discrepancy, and was still more puzzled when he found mention of a re-election of Jehan Henry as cantor on June 25, 1483,[30] impossible if the date of his death had been correctly given as February 2, 1483, but Coyècque did not explain the mystery. The explanation is to be found in the calendar. There is a document of the year 1484 which refers to a meeting of the Estates General in Tours of that year.[31] Félibien, who quotes it, ends with this sentence, "C'estoit vers le milieu du mois de Fevrier que l'on comptait encore 1483 selon l'ancient style." This must have applied to February 2 as well. Any date prior to Easter of the year 1484 according to our reckoning, would have been considered as belonging to the previous year,

[25] Guérard, *Cartulaire de . . . Notre-Dame . . .*, IV, 15.

[26] Paris, Archives de l'Assistance Publique, *MS 6369*.

[27] XXIV, 206.

[28] Félibien et Lobineau, *Histoire de la ville de Paris*, I (Paris, 1725), 877.

[29] *Ibid.*, I, 877; II, 604-606.

[30] Coyècque, *op. cit.*, I, 16, note.

[31] Félibien, *op. cit.*, I, 880.

1483. The recorded date of his death is therefore February 2, 1484, on our calendar.

In an investigation of the Estates General of 1484 in this connection, it was discovered that Jehan Henry had been one of the delegates. He was one of the two elected members representing the clergy of Paris, and apparently the senior delegate from Paris.[32] The meeting began on January 7, 1484, and the official royal appearance, that of the new king Charles VII, took place on January 14. On January 15, the chancellor addressed the meeting, and two days later Jehan Henry, "Cantor of Paris," replied in flattering language to the chancellor's speech. Then he disappeared from the scene. We read that on January 26, his colleague from Paris, Jean de Rély, was chosen to present the *cahiers* on the reform of the Church, and on February 4, as the representative of the clergy of Paris, he addressed the assembly on another matter. He was also chosen to make the closing address. Since Jehan Henry had made the first speech, and since he was a dignitary of the cathedral and his colleague was not, something must have happened to cut short his attendance and to have necessitated the appointment of a substitute. It seems probable that he was stricken with a sudden illness sometime after his speech on January 17, and that he died, possibly there at Tours, on the recorded date of February 2, 1484. There is no record of his death, and no mention of it in the accounts of the meeting, which did not end until some days later.

It is not known where La Croix du Maine got his information that Jehan Henry was buried at the Monastery of Fontaine-lès-Meaux. There was a priory at Meaux, sometimes called Fontaine-en-France.[33] It had been destroyed during the Hundred Years War, and reorganized, probably during the last quarter of the fifteenth century, by Fontevristes from Orléans. Jehan Henry may have taken a special interest in this house, and have expressed a wish to be buried there, but there is no evidence either of his interest or his burial. It is possible, that in view of his known interest in the Diocese of Evreux, and in at least one member of the Fontevriste house of Chaize-Dieu at Les Hautes Bruyères in that diocese,[34] that he may have been buried there rather than at Meaux. Such an error would be quite possible, especially if the information were transmitted by tradition or other undependable sources. The old form of the Latin name of Evreux, Mediolanum—Aulericolum,[35] could easily be confused, if ab-

[32] Jehan Masselin, *Journal des Etats Généraux de France tenus à Tours en 1484* (Paris, 1835), pp. 9, 67, 75-77; T. Quinet (Ed.), *Recueil général des stats tenus en France* (Paris, 1651), p. 32.

[33] *Histoire de l'Ordre de Fontevrault*, II, 11, 31; Curé de Saint-Sulpice, *Notre-Dame de France* (Paris, 1861), I, 262-263.

[34] Cf. page 305 above.

[35] Blosseville, *Dictionnaire Topographique: Eure*, p. 259.

breviated, with the Latin name of Meaux, *Meldae*. But we have found no trace of his burial in either diocese.

The writings of Jehan Henry must have enjoyed great popularity in the first quarter of a century after his death. At least eleven books attributed to him, and printed before 1517, are in the Bibliothèque Nationale today. They are:

Livre d'instruction pour religieuses novices et professes.

Livre de méditation sur la reparation de nature humaine.

Livre de réformation utile pour toutes religieuses desirans mener vie vertuese.

Jardin de contemplation.

Livre de la toute belle sans pair qui est la vierge Marie.

(The above are all guides for the religious life, and were published by Jean Petit in 1516.)

Pélerinage de Notre-Dame et de Joseph en Bethlehem.

(Commentary on the Psalm, *Eructavit*, published by Pierre le Dru.)

Le testament du trèsglorieux sainct et amy de Dieu monseigneur sainct hierosme, translaté de latin en francais.

La contemplation spirituelle.

Les épitres de sainct hierosme translaté de latin en francais.

Lexercice pour ieunes gens lesquels veullent parvenir en bien & perfection de leur estat.

Le sepulture spirituel.

(These five are of doubtful authorship and date, and have not been reexamined since they are at present inaccessible. The dates and publishers were not available for any of them at the Bibliothèque Nationale several years ago.)

One of his books, the *Livre d'instruction pour religieuses* . . . is found also in the Musée Condé at Chantilly, and in the British Museum. All of them deal with popular theology and instructions for the better practice of the religious life, in most cases with members of religious orders in mind. They have little interest today except for the antiquarian. None of them seems to have been republished. Jehan Henry was not a great writer or thinker, but a composer of religious homilies.

There is no way of knowing how Jehan Henry's manuscripts fell into the hands of their editor, or why they were published when they were. No manuscripts survive of those of his books which were printed, as far as we have been able to learn. Two of his works still exist only in manuscript, La gésine de Notre-Dame, written at the request of "Raoul, hermit of the forest of Haus", for Jeanne de France, daughter of Charles VII, and

wife of the Duc de Bourbon, Jean II.[36] The other work, which was dedicated to Perronnelle Helene, sub-prioress of the Hôtel-Dieu, 1482-1483, has attracted much more attention. It is the Livre de Vie Active, a beautifully illuminated treatise on theology and morals, written as an allegory depicting life in the Hôtel-Dieu of Paris in the late fifteenth century.[37] Its fame is probably due to the fact that the hospital personnel prized it so highly, and displayed it as their greatest treasure until its confiscation by the state in 1903. For a long time it had been assumed that this was the only copy in existence,[38] but a second, practically contemporary but inferior copy, was discovered by the writer on the shelves, and subsequently in the catalogue of the Bibliothèque Saint-Généviève in 1923.[39] Searches have been made in Paris and elsewhere for additional copies, but none have appeared. A rumor that there is one in the possession of the curé of one of the important churches of Paris was investigated with the kind help of priests at the Institut Catholique of Paris, but without results.

We know of one other work of Jehan Henry, at least one which was projected, for the editor of the *Chronique scandaleuse* of Jean de Roye found that Louis XI had commissioned Jean le Sellier and Jehan Henry to write a treatise on the Pragmatic Sanction.[40] Unable to examine the manuscript in Paris, we can only conclude that the reference was to a manuscript work on that subject, and not to the king's order to write it. The nature of manuscripts in this same group suggests that this is true.

Because of his selection by the king for this and other missions, and because of his connections with the court, with the house of Bourbon, and with the Hôtel-Dieu, it is obvious that the reputation of Jehan Henry must have once been greater than it is today. The fact that he wrote a book for the Franciscan Clarisses in the distant Auvergne, and another for the Hôtel-Dieu of Paris, confirms this as far as the religious orders were concerned. But most important of all is the mention, fourteen years after

[36] Bibliothèque Nationale, *MS Fonds français 1866;* Delisle, *Cabinet des manuscrits . . .*, I, 169, note 5, quotes the information from an inscription which he found in the Ms. The Duchess Jeanne had a library of some value, ten of her manuscripts being in the Bibliothèque Nationale today.

[37] Paris Archives de l'Assistance Publique, *MS 6369;* Dorothy Mackay Quynn, "A Medieval Picture of the Hôtel-Dieu of Paris", in *Bulletin of the History of Medicine,* XII, 118-128.

[38] Coyècque, *Hôtel-Dieu de Paris,* I, 16.

[39] *MS 1491.* Photostats of both MSS are now in the Duke University Library through the kindness of the Duke University Research Council.

[40] Bibliothèque Nationale *MS fr. 3887,* fol. 85 ff.; *Chronique scandaleuse,* I, 40, note.

his death, in a document defending the character of the members of the board of administration of the Hôtel-Dieu, at a time when they were the victims of scandal. The document points to the fame of the members of the board in the past, and speaks of Jehan Henry as one of the important people who had held this position.[41] His is the first of three names mentioned.

Various efforts have been made to obtain a clearer picture of this forgotten man, who apparently was so well known in his own day. In the course of the investigation, it appeared that he might have been a Franciscan. In the Livre de Vie Active he speaks at some length of his connection with a monastery of Franciscan nuns, the Clarisses of Aigueperse in the Auvergne. We concluded that he had served as their chaplain, and that it was in this capacity that he had written for them his *Jardin de contemplation*. Franciscan records were searched and the catalogues reexamined. Suddenly it looked as if the efforts were to be rewarded, for the name of "Jehan Henry, célèbre prédicateur" was found in a list of Franciscan biographies in a manuscript in the library at Lyon, where the manuscripts from Aigueperse had finally been taken. Negotiations for a photostat were in progress, and had to be abandoned, but Franciscan scholars in America were consulted, notably Père Archange Godbout of Montreal. He had records of this Jehan Henry, who was well-known to Franciscans, for he had been a provincial of Burgundy, and he had died at Lyon in 1575. Père Godbout was convinced that this must have been our Jehan Henry, partly because of his connection with Aigueperse in the province of Burgundy, but the dates are a century off, and there is no possibility of a chronological error in this case. Despite the likelihood that only a Franciscan could have held the position at Aigueperse, and that, as was quickly realized, Jehan Henry could not have possessed property if he had been a member of a mendicant order, and, therefore, was not a Franciscan, he was at Aigueperse, according to his own statements. He may have been a visiting preacher of some sort, with a brief appointment only.

It also seems strange that Henry should have dedicated two of his books to women, both of them nuns, one a sub-prioress, but the other only a novice. In the case of the former, a little imagination might depict a hospital executive in his efforts to flatter the head nurse. The novice is a little more puzzling, if not startling, unless we recall that she was a Fontevriste, and that Fontevrault was a refuge for princesses and other great ladies, and, of course, we do not know the age of our novice, nor her social status.

Finally, we found a portrait of Jehan Henry. The Livre de Vie Active

[41] Coyècque, *op. cit.*, II, 273.

contains a number of illuminations, done about the time of the completion of the book in 1483, in other words, by someone who might have known the author, or even worked under his supervision. One of the illuminations shows a priest kneeling before an allegorical figure of Pity. The inscription in the picture, *Lacteur,* undoubtedly refers to the author, and the word is repeatedly used in the text in this sense. So we now have a portrait, with an identifying label. His costume is that of a member of the cathedral chapter, not a mendicant friar.

DOROTHY MACKAY QUYNN

Duke University.

BOOK REVIEWS

CHURCH HISTORY

A Documented History of the Franciscan Order, 1182-1517. By Raphael M. Huber, O.F.M. Conv. (Milwaukee and Washington: The Author. Pp. xxxiv, 1028. $7.50.)

Perhaps one of the most difficult tasks in the field of history is to write an impartial history of the Franciscan Order. "Franciscan History is complicated by the divergent tendencies in the Order, and by the divisions and schisms to which these tendencies gave rise." (A. G. Little, *A Guide to Franciscan Studies,* London, 1920, p. 31.)

Father Huber has taken upon himself this arduous task to which he has devoted thirty years almost without interruption (p. xi). The present volume comprises only the period dating from the birth of St. Francis in 1182 to the division of the order in 1517. The author divides his history into three parts: I, from the beginning of the order to the reformation of Paolo a Trinci in 1368 (pp. 1-253); II, from the beginning of the reformation to the division of the Order in 1517 (pp. 255-517); and III, particular studies of various Franciscan themes, such as the sources of St. Francis' life and of the history of the order, the style and color of the Franciscan habit, the Franciscan apostolate in foreign countries, and the order's literary contribution up to 1517 (pp. 519-927). As a complement, there has been added at the end of the volume several useful chronological lists of the general ministers and general chapters up to 1517 and three copious alphabetical indexes of persons, of authors and artists, and of places and things (pp. 928-1028).

Because of its abundant documentation this history is one of the most outstanding works of its kind. It is a real arsenal of Franciscan bibliography. More than that, the author is not satisfied with quoting the sources and monographic studies on which he bases his assertions, but quite frequently, in footnotes, he quotes substantial passages of the documents. Therefore, it justly bears the title, *A Documented History of the Franciscan Order.* Considering the worth of the work from this viewpoint, it will be invaluable to all Franciscan historians and to those scholars who occasionally must treat about Franciscan subjects of the period, 1182-1517. The author lists around two thousand authors of monographic and historical studies dealing with the subject. Were it not for its numerous misprints, especially in the bibliographical notes, which greatly mar the book from beginning to end (more than 140, due in part to the printers), the volume could be considered one of the best of modern Franciscan bibliographical works. If the great quantity of wordy quotations contained in the book were added to what has been said above, perhaps it would not

be an exaggeration to consider it, at least in part, a kind of *enchiridion fontium historicarum franciscalium.*

Insofar as its historical value is concerned, one must carefully distinguish. One may judge this history from a dual viewpoint, that is, in accord with the author's purpose and as a contribution to ecclesiastical history in general. The author aimed at two principal ends: one, to offer an impartial description of the evolution of the Franciscan Order from its beginning to 1517, done according to the canons of modern historiography; the other, to justify historically the following declaration of Pius X: "The three families of the Minorite Order are as so many branches of a most noble tree, whose root and trunk is Francis" (*Septimo iam pleno,* October 4, 1909. Cf. pp. xiv, 513). In other words, none of the three Franciscan families—Capuchins, Conventuals, and Observants—may consider itself, excluding the other two, as "the parent stem" of the Franciscan Order.

With respect to the first objective, Father Huber attains it splendidly in the first and third parts of his work, excepting the part which treats about Franciscan missionary activity. That important aspect of Franciscan history is barely, if at all, touched upon in a short chapter of a few pages (pp. 771-783). He promises, however, to expound this subject more extensively in the second volume of his history. The reviewer need only remark that when the promise is fulfilled, the history of Franciscan missions up to 1517 will be out of its proper and natural place.

The second part of the present volume presents evidence which is susceptible of further discussion. The Most Reverend Joseph H. Schlarman, Bishop of Peoria and a friend of the author, says in the foreword: "There may be dissenting interpretations and no doubt other books will follow by other writers" (p. x). In reading the work with the author's second purpose in mind, the reader will find the reason for these "dissenting interpretations." When he finishes the second part, he will be inclined to believe that the family of the Conventuals is the "parent stem" of the other two; which is not quite in accord with what has been said above. It is true that as a conclusion of this section of his work, Father Huber asserts that all three families constitute the "parent stem" of the order; but this conclusion does not proceed logically from the evidence as it is exposed and interpreted here. As for the rest, it must be borne in mind that the solution of all these questions depends not only on the facts and documents adduced, but also on the principles according to which the facts and documents are judged.

Father Huber's volume, considered as a contribution to ecclesiastical history in general, is excellent for its bibliographical richness, for the scientific manner in which some aspects of the pontificate of John XXII are examined, and for its magnificent chapter devoted to the order's literary

contribution to the Catholic Church. However, it lacks a sufficient integration of the Franciscan history with the general history of the Church during the period from 1182 to 1517. The Franciscan Order, like every other religious order, is an imperfect society whose complete significance can be grasped only by placing it in strict relation to the perfect society which is the Church. Were this work given a fuller general ecclesiastical background, it would be of more interest to the general reader. Those outside the Franciscan Order will find this history tiresome because it is full of small disputes among the friars. In the same hypothesis, had the author not omitted here a full account of Franciscan missionary activities, perhaps the order's most important contribution to the Church, he could have better appreciated the efforts of Popes Martin V, Eugene IV, and Pius II who wished to use the order during the fifteenth century as a powerful instrument of Christian and social reform. This reform, however, was impossible until there took place within the order a full interior reform *in capite et in membris.*

In conclusion, weighing the merits and the defects of this work, the reviewer believes that the former by far outweigh the latter, and that all lovers of Franciscana will be grateful to the author for having facilitated their own research by providing them with a ready instrument with which to work, and one which should prove useful in their pursuit of further investigation and research in Franciscan studies.

FIDEL DE J. CHAUVET

Mexico, D. F.

Historia de la Iglesia en Yucatán desde 1887 hasta nuestros días. Por el Lic. Francisco Cantón Rosado. (Mérida de Yucatán: Compañia Tipográfica Yucateca. S.A. 1943. Pp. vii, 246.)

The present work is a continuation, as the author informs us in a preface, of a learned volume written by one of the late bishops of Yucatán, "el sabio Obispo Illmo. Sr. Dr. Dn. Crescancio Carrillo y Ancona." Carrillo y Ancona held the episcopal see from 1887 to 1897 and the history which the bishop wrote of his diocese from its foundation in 1518 to the death of his predecessor in 1887 was entitled *Historia del Obispado de Yucatán, de su fundación y de sus obispos.* Padre Francisco Rosado proposes to carry on from Bishop Carrillo's death. The first chapter is taken up with the career of Carrillo himself, and the story really begins with his birth and early education, progressing enthusiastically until his demise. Another chapter is given to the vicar-general of the diocese, *sede vacante*; a third to Carrillo's successor, Bishop José Guadalupe de Jesús Alva. The last four chapters deal with the government of Archbishop Martin Tritschler y Córdova, under whom the see was raised to the dignity of an archbishopric and whose later years were shadowed by the troubles of

the revolution. Archbishop Tritschler ruled the see of Yucatán from 1910 to 1942.

These chapters make rather difficult reading, for the material has not been too well organized. There are long quotations which break up the continuity of what should be the main stream of the narrative and with the introduction of each new bishop or vicar general the reader is carried back to sometimes very minute and irrelevant details of his earlier life. The style is of an older period, say the middle of the nineteenth century, but it is not without its charm for those who may be sympathetic. It is pious, it is digressive, given often to partisanship and propaganda, and in places descending into mere chronology. Hardly ever is a priest or bishop mentioned without an epithet: *el sabio, el respetable, el celoso,* and the rest.

The most interesting and informative portion of the work is that which describes the coming of the revolution to Yucatán in September, 1914. Later the revolutionaries were expelled from Mérida, the capital, but the town was shortly retaken by radicals commanding an armed force. Mérida underwent the fate of other cathedral cities and she saw her schools and churches closed and some of the latter destroyed. But Archbishop Tritschler lived to see better days.

PETER M. DUNNE

University of San Francisco

Francesca Cabrini. Without Staff or Scrip. By LUCILLE PAPIN BORDEN. (New York: Macmillan Co. 1945. Pp. x, 402. $2.75.)

The current year has produced two biographies of the Italian-American *beata,* Francesca Cabrini, that is if the book here reviewed can be considered a biography. Its sub-title "Without Scrip or Staff" does furnish the theme. Mother Cabrini crossed the ocean twenty-four times in twenty years, trained and educated 4,000 women to carry on the works of her Institute of the Missionary Sisters of the Sacred Heart of Jesus in sixty-seven foundations which comprised orphanages, colleges, academies, high schools, parochial schools, hospitals, and sanatoria. These radiating from Italy as a center, were located in France and England, in North, Middle, and South America, wherever the Italian immigrant found a new home. And all this she accomplished without any thought of dollars, pesos, or pounds. Though the Italian foundress initiated each new foundation without "script," the enterprise never long lacked funds, for she had an uncanny knack as a result of visions, dreams, or just God-given common sense of selecting the best possible site for her need and then of persuading the owner that she could put it to a far better purpose than the one it was serving. It usually ended with the coveted building or land in her possession. It had been acquired as a gift or at a nominal sum.

The author of the biography is so carried away by enthusiasm that she

frequently identifies herself with the subject of her book and it is difficult sometimes to decide where Mother Cabrini's meditations leave off and Mrs. Borden's begin. Using the novelist's prerogative of omniscience, she tells what Mother Cabrini thought at the moment, recollected from the past, or mentally projected into the future. Again in a biography of this sort one would gladly forego the topographical, historical, and cultural details of each of the countries in which Mother Cabrini made her foundations and would feign learn more of the details of those foundations. One would like to know the secret by which she overrode such obstacles as: the objections to the name by which she wished her Institute to be known; the misunderstandings or opposition she met from prelates in New York, Buenos Aires, and Paris; the difficulty of separating business magnates from their money and of persuading them to transfer estates from where they were doing less good to where she thought they would do most good.

Regrettably there are several errors of fact in the book. In describing the foundation of the Milan house in 1884, the author says that John Evelyn's seventeenth-century description of that city must have highly amused the sisters—a gratuitous aasumption this! She then goes on to describe the Milan of the 1880's in which she says "trams, both steam and electric, ran to its many suburbs." Did Milan have electric cars before Edison's experiments? Again she blames typhoid occurrences on the prevalence of the mosquito. I wonder would the scientist agree. Also the famous Italian episode of 1892 in New Orleans is not presented with historical accuracy.

The general impression one gets of this valiant apostle of Catholic Action is of a soul chosen by Almighty God to fulfill a definite task, that of saving the faith of the Italian immigrant. This work was undertaken under the direction of Pope Leo XIII who, well-informed on the problems of the Universal Church, realized the danger that the Italians in new lands faced when, lacking the familiar religious environment of their native land, they were exposed to strange customs and alien habits of thought. He wisely concluded that the zealous missionary would here find a more fertile field for her activity than in the Far East missions which she had craved.

On the whole, the book, although it may not always accord with the best traditions of biography production, will have fulfilled its purpose. It has presented the Catholic ideal of sanctity in a twentieth-century setting. The belief that Francesca Cabrini, awarded the "Grand Prix" on this earth for the work she accomplished among Italian immigrants, likewise received the great prize in the heavenly courts, encourages those who read her life to profit by her example.

SISTER MARY CELESTE LEGER

St. Xavier College
Chicago

The Popes' New Order. A Systematic Summary of the Social Encyclicals and Addresses from Leo XIII to Pius XII. By PHILIP HUGHES. (New York: Macmillan Co. 1944. Pp. viii, 331. $2.50.)

Were Europe and the world to stumble back into the old order after the present ordeal, it would be an unforgivable tragedy, for the old order harbors those germs of conflict which at uncertain intervals break out into world wars. Now that Hitler's new order is stillborn, is there anyone who has practical solutions for world problems except that dictator whose name is "Steel"? If current affairs are any criterion, it would appear that the western democracies have been so completely absorbed in forging a military victory that they have forgotten to plan for peace and have thereby lost the initiative to Comrade Stalin.

If our statesmen of the western democracies were not blinded by secularism, they would recognize that there is available a new order which will ensure peace and freedom for all peoples. This is *The Popes' New Order*. It is so founded upon the natural law and the Christian tradition of our western culture that it ought to be acceptable to all men of good will. For sixty-five years this new order has been in course of development and has behind it the wisdom of such men as Leo XIII, Benedict XV, Pius XI, and Pius XII. The chief obstacle to a clear understanding of this new order is the fact that it is hidden in a multitude of lengthy documents that take a scholar's perseverance to read. The English historian, Father Philip Hughes, has tried to overcome this difficulty by summarizing these messages and by grouping them into a logical order. This excellent book testifies to the success of his endeavor.

In nine chapters, thirty-eight outstanding social documents are not only summarized but are prefaced by brief introductions giving the proper historical setting and an analytic outline of the contents. The chapters are devoted to such important and vital topics as "The Fundamental Causes of World Unrest and the Only Real Solution," "The State and its Powers," "The Catholic Attitude to the Modern State," "Ideals in Education," "The Capitalistic System and the Worker," and "The International Problem."

Thanks to Father Hughes, the substance of papal social doctrine is now available in plain English which any high school student can understand. Those who read this book with unprejudiced minds will be forced to admit that the popes offer a workable solution for the contemporary crisis. Theirs is no visionary doctrine lost in utopian ideals nor have they compromised themselves by refusing to face the real issues. The evils of Fascism, communism, exaggerated nationalism, paganism, unrestrained capitalism are honestly discussed and definitely rejected. In the place of these erroneous systems the popes present a realistic new order which the world will refuse only at its own peril.

There are a few minor slips in the volume that ought to be corrected in future editions. English Catholic authors are sometimes not sufficiently well-acquainted with American Catholic scholarship. Thus, Hughes writes concerning the encyclical *Iniquis Afflictisque*: "There is not an available English translation" (p. 135). May the reviewer refer him to Ryan's *Encyclicals of Pius XI* (Herder, 1927), pp. 226-248? Secondly, *La Sollenità* should be *La Solennità* (p. 249 ff.). Although papal addresses are usually known by their opening words, no title is given to the address to the Congress of Catholic Nurses (p. 292). It should be *Voilà un Coup d'Oeil, (Documentation Catholique,* XXXIV, cc. 325-327). The book concludes with an index of twenty-three pages. Extensive as it is, the index could be better. There are important passages on the following subjects—prayer, the Mystical Body, corporatism—although these headings are not listed. Among those listed, the references are not complete on such subjects as Catholic Action (pp. 27, 203), strikes (p. 20), and Fascism (p. 241).

Hughes has not published this book for his professional brethren, who will prefer to study the actual texts. But he has written it for the vast number of intelligent people who are seriously perplexed by the post-war situation but who have not the time to read all the papal encyclicals. If our Catholic high school and college students, as well as priests and sisters and members of study and discussion groups, would read this volume, the Church in America could contribute mightily to a just and lasting peace.

HARRY C. KOENIG

St. Mary of the Lake Seminary
Mundelein

The Pioneer Catholic Church of Chester County. Saint Agnes, West Chester, Pennsylvania, 1793-1943. By WILLIAM B. SCHUYLER. (Philadelphia: Peter Reilly Co. 1944. Pp. xii, 283.)

Not until good parochial histories are written of at least the historically more important parishes in a diocese can one expect a solid history of that diocese. It is principally the lack of worthy parish histories that is preventing the production of scholarly diocesan histories in the United States. Most parish histories written on the occasion of a parish jubilee are simply eulogistic essays, written largely from memory, excessively laudatory and historically unreliable. The history of St. Agnes, written on the occasion of the sesqui-centennial jubilee of the parish, is a happy exception to the general run of parish histories.

The weakness of many parish histories usually derives from one or both of two sources: they are either written by one who has had no training in history, or they lack sufficient research. St. Agnes' history is a fortunate

exception because its author has been interested in and writing history for the past thirty years. Furthermore, his background qualified him eminently for this work. "Almost from the dawn of my life I have known of Chester County" (p. xi). It is evident that the research in this work extended beyond the rectory and that it was planned months ahead—another negligence which often occasions poor jubilee histories. The author used not only the pertinent monographs, secular as well as religious, but also newspapers, unpublished manuscripts, the holdings of the local historical societies, and family records.

Not many parishes in the United States can boast of a lifetime of a century and a half as can St. Agnes. It has had many prominent pastors, among them Father Samuel B. Spalding of the Maryland Spaldings and Lancasters, who fostered the idea of founding Immaculata College. Being the mother church of its section of the Diocese of Philadelphia, St. Agnes is worthy of this history, which abounds in detail from a description of the old trails and roads into that region to an accurate account of the first offertory collection of $5.98½ (p. 82). Heavily documented, the work is a nice blend between the erudite and the popular version making it readable for all. Light and even humorous in places, the volume nevertheless always rests on solid sources. There is no attempt at eulogizing. The author succeeded admirably in achieving the purpose he set for himself, "to make the deeds of five or more generations speak for themselves" (p. xii).

The division of the volume is chronological. It is based on the progress of the parish as a unit under the administrations of the particular pastors. This arrangement works out much better than assigning chapters to the various parochial organizations and it gives a more unified story. Three large maps show the mission stations served by the priests of St. Agnes at different times and another map portrays the original Chester County. The lists in the appendix of the parish clergy, pastors and assistants, and of young men and women from the parish who have entered the religious life are complete and of real value.

In places capitalization seems excessive. "Sliver" should be "silver" (p. 186), and the temperance crusader, Father Mathew, did not spell his name with two t's (p. 164). One omission may be cited. No doubt the fact that the author is a brother of the present pastor, Father Henry C. Schuyler, caused him to be silent on the scholarship of the latter, who has seven widely-read volumes to his credit and who is one of the most prolific writers among the Philadelphia clergy.

HUGH J. NOLAN

St. James High School
Chester, Pennsylvania

GENERAL HISTORY

The Quest for Political Unity in World History. Edited for the American Historical Association by Stanley Pargellis. (Washington: Government Printing Office. 1944. Pp. xiv, 386. $1.00.)

For some time, while access to information has been restricted, the public has been led to expect a vastly rosier future to follow closely upon the end of the war. Consciously or otherwise, radio and newspaper men, and some professors who should know better, have built up the picture of a world suddenly and solidly united in peaceful institutions where discord shall have given way to harmony and conflict end in reasonable settlement. That this is a fair hope toward which men must not only yearn but also work, none would deny; but there should be more awareness of the difficulties, of the possible reactions from the proposals, the necessity of great effort, the problems of structure involved, and the uselessness of structure in the absence of co-operative spirit.

It is, therefore, refreshing and stimulating to read this collection of historical lectures prepared for delivery at Columbus, Ohio, in 1942, but actually presented as Volume III of the *Annual Report* of the American Historical Association for that year. The volume does not include the whole program, but it does contain thirty-two articles, each devoted to a particular aspect of the struggle between diversity and unity in the historic past.

Members of the American Catholic Historical Association will be especially interested in the first part of the book, seven articles on the religious foundations of the concept of world unity in Confucianism, Catholicism, and Protestantism. The first study indicates that the political unity of China was both the cause and the effect of the Confucian doctrine of the just ruler as the Son of Heaven, which has helped to prepare even modern Chinese for participation in a world society. Patristic writers looked upon world political unity as a unity of law which would grow out of the "rational acceptance of the dominion of Christ in this life," the harmony of peoples within the Church. For the mediaevalist, Church and State were each obligated to work toward that world unity which was a part of Christian eschatology, evident in the presence of God in the sacrament. Langland's *Piers Plowman* sets forth a functional political hierarchy, derived from Christian concepts of the primacy of the spiritual order and the universality of the Church, mirrored in society. The last three articles of this first section discuss the internal struggle toward tolerance and unity among Dutch Calvinists, the trends into and away from Christianity in the last seventy years, and the unexpected strength with which a weakened Russian Church has survived and modified the attack of the state.

The second and third parts of the volume treat problems which develop in the combination of nations into regional or universal forms of order, and problems of political division and consensus within single states. Included among the first are the varied forms of economic regionalism inherent in Athenian foreign policies and in mercantilist and geopolitical ideas of political order. Further examples of regional trends are found in the federative movement among Arab states; the conflict between the policies of free trade and commonwealth security in the British dominions; and the struggle between nationalism and internationalism at Versailles and thereafter. Among the problems of internal unity is an analysis of Rome's failure to maintain centralized authority over divergent outlying areas without creating the danger of military dictatorship at home. There is also a discussion of the unifying influence of common law concepts of liberty in the development of resistance to absolutism and liberty under law; the emergence of Whig and Tory as party labels; the varying importance of military and bureaucratic classes under Japanese, German, and Russian totalitarian systems. There are two articles on the varying processes by which American life is absorbing Indians and Swedes without losing their special group values. By comparison, the acceptance of the Negro into the political community is reflected in a long train of judicial decisions. The final article discusses the *Pax Romana, Pax Ecclesiae,* and *Pax Britannica* as background for the concept of world federation without which its author believes peace will not be organized.

This review is little more than the sampling of the contents of a book which will reward readers with its evidence of the recurrent patterns of unification and diversification in history, and the hope that institutions may be found for the future recurrence of such counter-trends without resort to arms for settlement. A brief preface, the page references of which have not been completely checked with the paging, offers the thread of idea which ties the lectures together.

ELIZABETH M. LYNSKEY

Hunter College

The Arab Heritage. Edited by NABIH AMIN FARIS. (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1944. Pp. xi, 279. $3.00.)

The present work is the outcome of a series of lectures delivered during the summer session of 1941 at Princeton University by eminent specialists in Semitic philology and Arabic-Islamic studies. Most of the original lectures are reproduced in this volume, naturally in a popular adaptation making them more accessible to the general public. The work which is an excellent general introduction to Arab history, retains, we are told, all that could be of special interest in the present circumstances when attention is focussed upon the Arab-Islamic world. Even if this view is some-

what of an exaggeration, as the Arab-Islamic problem is only a part of a larger, difficult problem or set of problems, it remains true that the object of the lectures, quite praiseworthy in itself, is to promote genuine goodwill among different groups of nations, through proper mutual understanding and appreciation—an excellent idea to which every one will subscribe heartily.

The wealth of material offered to the reader will become apparent from the enumeration of the contents. It may be added that each chapter, except the first, is followed by a select bibliography which will help the more ambitious reader to follow up the subject in which he might happen to be especially interested. It may be said that the bibliographies are, as a rule, well selected, even if at times one might wish the one or the other work to have been included. But this is a matter of taste and opinion. We should be grateful for what is given by the well-informed authors themselves.

Dr. Philip K. Hitti writes the fine introductory chapter, "America and the Arab Heritage," a difficult task on account of its vastness, since it is a survey of Arabic and Islamic studies in general and in the United States in particular. Evidently it is not possible for the author to examine closely all the aspects of the immense subject. The careful reader will find in the following chapters some corrections or qualifications to several more or less disputed points. The next chapter by G. L. Della Vida of the University of Pennsylvania treats of "Pre-Islamic Arabia." This essay is a good example of careful scholarship which refuses to yield to the temptation of speculation to fill in the gaps of our information which means to remain on the solid ground of facts and does not force the facts to yield more than they can yield really. Professor Della Vida notes carefully that while "certain main lines of the development of the ancient history of Arabia may be ascertained," much must remain obscure for the present at least, as long as archaeological investigation is impossible, owing to the narrow-minded policy of the present rulers of Arabia, and, we may add, the ignorance and prejudices of the ordinary people. In passing the author notes a fact which is at times not recognized sufficiently, viz., the difference between Arabian and Islamic; the Arab heritage is by no means purely Arabian, even if its envelop is Arabic.

The most extensive contribution is that of Julian Obermann of Yale dealing with "Islamic Origins: a Study in Background and Foundation." This study of the relationships of Islam with Judaism and Christianity, based on thorough familiarity with the text of the Koran, deserves close attention. Mohammed owed his knowledge of Judaism and Christianity to oral traditions and personal observations, not to the canonical literature. Much of his material, especially in the case of Christianity, comes from apocryphal sources and is derived from strangely unorthodox forms

of Christianity. "The Growth and Structure of Arabic Poetry, A.D. 500-1000," is the subject treated by Gustave E. von Grunebaum. This is illustrated by a choice of some poems—in translation—given in the appendix (pp. 130 ff.). If any one can inspire love for Arabic poetry, it will be Professor von Grunebaum, who has made the subject his own special field. We wish him many converts who would admire that poetry, which to many will often appear complex and rather artificial.

The general editor, N. A. Faris, presents "al-Ghozzālē" in the next chapter, a most attractive figure of Islam, fully deserving the attention given to him, on account of his own personality and of his influence which is still felt, as a thinker and as a religious man. Professor John L. La Monte reviews the 200-year wars of Islam and Christianity under the title, "Crusade and Jihād," a complicated history, difficult to appreciate fairly on account of the many different aspects of the religious, political, and other interests at stake. That everybody will agree unreservedly with the author's appreciation is clearly more than may be expected; but this does not detract from the value of the essay. Henry L. Savage treats the reader, in lighter vein, to a journey to the Near East in "Fourteenth Century Jerusalem and Cairo through Western Eyes." It is the acccunt of the pilgrimage made in 1395 by Baron Ogier d'Ariglure (Ariglure is in the Département of Marne). The narrative, as summarized by Professor Savage, is very interesting: it gives us the impressions of a western traveller in his contact with the Orient, Moslem and Christian. On the whole, the traveller is generous in his appreciations. "The Course of Arab Scientific Thought" is described by Edward J. Jurji, a stimulating survey of the various branches of knowledge in which the Arabs distinguished themselves. Here, also, we may say and as is recognized by the author, all that is Arabic in language is by no means Arabic in origin. Many of the Arabic-speaking and Arabic-writing authors were not Arabs. And without denying to the Arabs all credit for contributing to progress, it must not be forgotten that the foundations of Arab scientific thought were non-Arabian, but chiefly Greek, then Syrian, Persian, and Hindu (cf. also p. 1 f.). In scientific study, isolationism could lead only to barrenness. The last chapter by Richard Ettinghausen is on "The Character of Islamic Art," a worthy conclusion to the work, with excellent plates (pp. 264-5). This is a fine presentation which the non-specialist will enjoy as a very instructive introduction to the subject.

It is evident that in a work like this, covering such an abundant variety of subjects, there is room for differences of opinion on certain points. What must be striven after is essentially perfect objectivity. It may be recognized that the contributors have done their work in a most satisfactory manner and deserve our congratulations. In different places, the one or the other notes, more or less emphatically, that the Arabs proper are

not the sole carriers of the traditions of culture and science that form the Arab heritage, that many others who were not Arabs in race or nationality or even were not adherents of Islam had their important share in the creating and in the developing of those traditions. This must not be forgotten so that we may give due credit to the Arabs and to the others who contributed to the so-called Arab heritage and that we may not create a false Pan-Arabism.

In some places, the reader must make a distinction between the facts themselves and their interpretation by the one or the other contributor. Thus, the summary of the pilgrim's voyage by Professor Savage may be taken as correct as well as interesting. But when he gives us his interpretation (pp. 213 ff.), we feel on more shaky ground. He tells us: ". . . you will remember that Ogier himself may have had quite private reasons for wishing to receive whatever pardon or remission of purgatorial pain that particular relic or site could of itself confer upon the devout petitioner" (p. 214). What does the phrase mean? If it is intended as implying Catholic doctrine that would underlie the pilgrim's conduct, it must be termed completely erroneous; there is no relic nor sacred site, no matter how genuine or venerable, which, according to Catholic doctrine, "could of itself" confer such a favor upon the faithful. If it is meant as giving Ogier's view, we could only conclude that Ogier was grossly ignorant of his faith. But then texts should be given, proving the fact of such ignorance. True, he was not very critical, no more than his contemporaries, Christian or Moslem, in the matter of the authenticity of relics and sacred sites. But this does not authorize the conclusion that he would be ignorant of his faith. Again we have—to put it charitably—a needless "dig" when we are told that from Ogier "we are not to expect long, priest-inspired disquisitions on the superiority of Christianity over Islam" (p. 215). Dr. Savage seems to be surprised that Ogier, a Roman Catholic, does not use any "opprobrious or discourteous word upon" the schismatic Oriental Christians (pp. 218 ff.). This only shows that Ogier —and, in fact, those Oriental Christians—were gentlemen and good Christians. Perhaps if Dr. Savage were better acquainted with the attitude of the Roman Church—from official reliable sources—towards the Oriental Schismatics, he would be less surprised, or rather the documents would have quite a few surprises for him.

In Dr. Hitti's excellent chapter, the reader may find also some statements open to more or less serious challenge. Some of the words mentioned on page 5 came to the West through the Arabs who themselves had received them from others. The statement that Islam is the only religion "that can claim to have met Christianity and defeated it" (p. 7) would need a good deal of explaining; the few lines of the paragraph do not do so satisfactorily. Some expressions of the author would suggest something

like the old European anti-clericalism of the so-called liberals (pp. 8, 10, 13), though one may take the author to be quoting or reporting. We are told that "formal Arabic studies in Europe had not only a late but an unfortunate start" (p. 9), because the motive prompting those studies was missionary; the conversion of the Saracens. How could this necessarily prevent one from acquiring a good knowledge of the language and of its literature? Must we not make allowance for the circumstances? And beside the missionaries, we have others who had no such motive, for example, the school of translators in Toledo.

The author has (p. 14) some interesting suggestions on the subject of teaching Arabic: Arabic should not be treated as a dead language. He points out also some sources of difficulties as e. g., the ignorance of grammar by prospective students, certainly a most serious handicap to the study of a language like Arabic. This subject could be developed with great advantage, and Dr. Hitti, with his valuable experience, could treat the question excellently.

To conclude, the non-specialist will find in this work an excellent introduction to Arabic studies, and the specialist, who cannot be a specialist in every branch, will also learn from a use of *The Arab Heritage*.

EDWARD P. ARBEZ

The Catholic University of America

Belgium. Edited by JAN-ALBERT GORIS. (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press. 1945. Pp. xx, 478. $5.00.)

The reader who keeps in mind the purpose of the United Nations Series will find it difficult to use anything but words of praise for this book on Belgium. The purpose of the series is stated by Professor Robert J. Kerner, the general editor, when he notes that these books are "dedicated to the task of mutual understanding among the Allies and to the achievement of successful co-operation in this war and in the coming peace." Without doubt, the purpose of promoting mutual understanding between the people of Belgium and English-speaking peoples is achieved by this group of American and Belgian scholars and writers under the editorship of Jan-Albert Goris.

The roster of contributors is not the least impressive feature of the work. The men chosen seem eminently qualified to handle the task assigned them. That this task is an ambitious one is clear from the mere enumeration of the topics into which the work is divided. Starting with a chapter giving the setting, the contributors present interesting, though necessarily all-too-short, considerations of the historical background, political, constitutional, economic and social development, cultural aspects,

the Belgian Congo, and finally, a brief discussion of World War II and a quick look into the future.

The chapters are not of equal merit, nor are they all above criticism. Fair judgment, however, must be based on the realization that the authors worked under difficulties which, in some cases, prevented them from having access to the sources which are the basis of their conclusions. Furthermore, a certain amount of repetition in such a work is obviously unavoidable, though in this work it is kept at a minimum.

It is to the credit of the contributors, under the guidance of the editor, that some very provocative questions have been handled with wisdom and moderation. For example, the presentation of the difficult problems arising out of the Flemish movement is restrained and well-balanced. Moreover, the reader will hardly suspect that there are possibilities of important cleavages due to the religious problem. The school question is discussed simply and directly, with little indication of the bitter feelings that such a problem can engender.

A brief review of the history of the Belgian Congo from the point of view of the Belgian government is a welcome addition to this work. However, the historian will suspect that the author of the chapter on the historical development of the Congo avoids the discussion of problems arising out of the conduct of the government under Leopold II, problems which caused much agitation in other countries at the time. The omission of such a discussion may be due to the fact that the general tendency of the book seems to be to present the monarchy of Belgium in the best possible light. This conclusion is strengthened when one realizes that there is no discussion of the burning question of Leopold III's actions during the recent occupation, nor is there mention of the future of the monarchy in the post-war world.

However, there can be no doubt that this work eminently serves its purpose of promoting better understanding among the United Nations. Moreover, the student of European history will be grateful for a book which gives such a complete picture of a country which is usually studied only in its relations with the policies of the greater European nations. Heroic Belgium deserves to be better understood by a world which will have to offer the hand of fellowship in helping this courageous people to regain her rightful place in a world at peace. Her problems, economic and social, are tremendous. A sympathetic world will the more willingly offer the necessary help and encouragement when it understands the problems of Belgium. It will understand her problems and needs better, thanks to the efforts of those who contributed to this volume in the United Nation Series.

HAROLD L. STANSELL.

St. Louis University.

The Growth of German Historicism. By FRIEDRICH ENGEL-JANOSI. [Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science, Series LXII, No. 2.] (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press. 1944. Pp. xiv, 101. $1.25.)

The monograph here under review presents the fruit of research done for a course given at Johns Hopkins in 1940-41 by an historian of international note who brings to his subject extensive knowledge and discerning judgment, and who writes with a dignity of style worthy of the theme.

In substance Professor Engel-Janosi's essay is a comparative study of the leading historical writers of the nineteenth century with a view to determining their estimate of three basic factors conceived as shaping the course of human events and guiding their interpretation, to wit, individuality, development (or progress) and success, as the author designates them. The writers selected for his study are Herder, Humboldt, Goethe, Niebuhr, the Romanticists, Hegel, Ranke, Marx, Schopenhauer, and Burckhardt. The choice is judiciously made, for in these men one easily recognizes the prophets who contributed no small share to the forming (and some of them also to the confusing) of German historical thought during a fateful period of world history, and who, moreover, well exemplify the historicism whose growth Dr. Engel-Janosi undertakes to trace. This he describes as "the attitude . . . which saw most of the spheres of intellectual life as permeated by history" and "which made history the *magistra*, if not of active life, at least, to a great extent, of theoretical life." Besides an excellent index, two chronological tables, one giving biographical dates and writings important in the development of historical thought, and the other presenting a synchronized view of historical writers in Germany, France, Italy, England, and the United States from *ca.* 1750 to *ca.* 1890, add greatly to the usefulness of an otherwise useful work.

The distinguished author has done his part loyally. He has carefully analyzed what each of the named writers thought about human individuality, development, and success, as factors in history, and then he has set that forth with as much clearness and accuracy as each writer's thinking and expression would allow, without, however, offering any critical judgment of his own as to its logical and historical validity. Yet for all the analyzing, it can hardly be said that any of the German seers has brought us appreciably nearer to an acceptable definition of individuality, progress, and success, such as may serve to deepen our understanding of the historical process and of the ultimate significance of human events, a thing which a philosophic view of history should help us to achieve.

What Professor Engel-Janosi's exposition actually does, though he does not expressly point that out, is to reveal the confusing spectacle of *quot*

homines, tot sententiae—a medley of divergent views and generalizations which leave one just wondering what individuality really does in history and by what standards progress and success in human affairs are to be measured. At the bottom of the confusion lies, of course, the modern misconception of what man, the principal actor in human history, really is. Man's personality having been dissociated from its origins and ultimate destiny in the speculations of the modern seers, it has become the plaything of arbitrary theorizing uncontrolled by objective truths and facts.

Hence a good deal more remains to be said about individuality, development, and success than has been said by the prophets of Germany so carefully examined by the author. And if the noted scholar were to follow up the present expository monograph by a critical study showing, on the one hand, all that lies hidden in human personality and by what criteria development and success are to be estimated, and, on the other, to what extent the German writers recognize or ignore those criteria and, therefore, are or are not safe guides to the historian, we should be no less grateful to him for such a study than we are for the present one.

DEMETRIUS B. ZEMA

Our Lady of Martyrs Tertianship
Auriesville, New York

MEDIAEVAL HISTORY

Vassi and Fideles in the Carolingian Empire. By CHARLES EDWIN ODEGAARD. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1945. Pp. 166. $1.00.)

Of all the phases of mediaeval history one of the most intensively studied has been the institutions of the Merovingian and Carolingian periods. The scarcity of documents, particularly for the earlier period, has been no obstacle to scholars. Rather has it seemed to lead them to try to squeeze from them some new ray of light or some new interpretation of their meaning. In spite of the vast literature on the subject, Professor, and at present Lieutenant Commander, Odegaard has amply justified his little volume on the vassals and *fideles* in the Carolingian period.

In studying the political status of the French bishops of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries he soon realized the need for a clearer view of their true position in the earlier period. This in turn led him to clarify the meaning of the terms vassal and *fideles*. To avoid the pitfalls entailed in using texts of one period to determine the meaning of terms used in an earlier one, he limited himself to those written between 751-888, a period which has an intrinsic unity and adequate material.

Students of the period have hitherto failed to agree on an exact definition of the term *vassus*. Some historians would identify the *commendatus* with the *vassus* so that all who commended themselves to a seignior were vassals. With such an interpretation they include as vassals bishops, abbots, counts and other functionaries and great magnates. Other historians, however, have made a distinction between bishops, abbots, counts, functionaries, and great magnates on the one hand and "real" vassals on the other. The former have been almost vassals, or like vassals, but they were not "real" vassals. The distinction between "real" vassals and vassals in general has escaped pinning down. The author has finally given a clear answer and shown that his conclusions can fit even those cases in which the texts have led rather to confusion than clarity. "A vassal is a man who commends himself to his seignior to serve above all as a properly equipped and properly trained armed retainer." He did not have any definite territory assigned to him as an administrative portion of the kingdom as the count had his *comitatus* and the bishop his *parochia*. A vassal could transfer his service, with permission, from one seignior to another; hence the distinction between royal vassals and vassals of bishops, abbots, counts, etc. Bishops, abbots, and counts did not receive permission to transfer their service to a new seignior. They were of a higher rank than the vassals and were not of them as is indicated by such expressions as "episcopi, abbates, comites ac vassi dominici." Vassals became a special category with a function of their own during the Carolingian period as a logical result of the shift from infantry to cavalry, and the special requirements of providing one's own maintenance and arms while serving monarchs without pay in distant and expensive wars.

In the second part of this study Professor Odegaard shows that those who have been described as being vassals and yet were not quite vassals should be called *fideles*. They, too, were *commendati*, but whereas the vassal was a fighting man primarily, the *fideles*, such as the bishops, abbots, counts, and functionaries promised to be faithful helpers, giving counsel and aid each in accordance with his function and person. Thus the bishop and abbot while commending themselves to the king and promising fidelity did not promise the military service of the vassal but rather the aid and counsel they would give him as bishops and abbots. It is as *fideles* that bishops and abbots accepted the king as seignior. The proper term for these royal servants was *fideles*, although occasionally the term *homines* was used. The term *homo*, the author suggests, should be reserved for the faithful servants of private seigniors.

JAMES A. CORBETT

University of Notre Dame

English Prayer Books: an Introduction to the Literature of Christian Public Worship. By STANLEY MORISON. (Cambridge at the University Press. New York: Macmillan Co. 1943. Pp. viii, 143. $1.75.)

This small volume is the first in a series edited by W. R. Matthews, Dean of St. Paul's and F. W. Dwelly, Dean of Liverpool, "on the essentials of Christian worship as they have developed in the course of Christian history." It is the intention of the editors to make the series interdenominational by assigning individual studies to members of different creeds. The ultimate purpose of the series is to complement the increased intellectual interest in the truths of Christian theology by relating them to the emotional life. The present work deals with books used in liturgical worship; succeeding volumes will examine the nature of Christian worship, church music, design, architecture, and related subjects.

If all the works in the series are written with the intelligence and interest of the first volume, they will enjoy a wider sphere of usefulness than the immediate objective of the author and the editors indicates. Stanley Morison, friend and associate of such celebrated liturgiologists as Edmund Bishop, Abbot Cabrol, Dr. Adrian Fortescue, and Herbert Thurston, S.J., whose aid he acknowledges and whose loss he mourns, has presented within comparatively few pages a lucid historical and bibliographical account of service books used in England from its conversion to Christianity to the present day.

As one would expect, over half of the work deals with the history of the development of the Roman Catholic liturgy in England as traced through the service books extant. The discussion reaches back, therefore, to the *Didache* and proceeds through the apostolic tradition to the *Sacramentary* of Pope St. Gregory who sent St. Augustine of Canterbury to England. From St. Augustine's day the bibliographical history of the liturgy is traced through the service books of the various rites—York, Sarum, Hereford—to the Protestant Revolution. The final chapters deal with the nature and origin of the *Book of Common Prayer,* its suppression and re-edition, with the revival of liturgical interest among Anglicans of the later Oxford Movement, and with liturgy among the Non-Conformists.

Although the major emphasis of the work is bibliographical—the author is more concerned with the format, decoration, and general excellence of the "copy," whether manuscript or printed work—the reader will find much to interest him in the accompanying survey not only of the development of liturgy but of liturgical scholarship. Liturgiology has but recently come into its own as a serious study, not simply an antiquarian's hobby or a collector's delight in "merely" beautiful books. The scholarly studies and editions of Duchesne, Batiffol, Bäumer, and Bishop were pioneer works in the field and the imprints of the editions and studies re-

veal the widespread and rapidly increasing interest in the subject among scholars.

The absence of footnotes to the closely-packed discussion is partially compensated for by a postscript which provides a running account of the major works used. A double index, one of authors and printers, the other of prayer books and literature, enhances the utility of the book as a working manual. Both the postscript and indices, however, by their mention of famous European libraries, both public and private collections of manuscripts and books now known to have been scattered or completely destroyed, inevitably remind the reader of the present war's great devastation of the finest and most sacred flowering of western culture. Even the printing houses have not been spared. Firms with ancient traditions of fine printing and centuries of skill in craftsmanship have been turned into munition works. The spirit that inspires liturgical worship, indeed, needs to be revived if the civilization that Mr. Morison's book represents is to survive.

SISTER M. EMMANUEL COLLINS
The Catholic University of America

MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

The Classical Republicans. By ZERA S. FINK. [Northwestern University Studies in the Humanities. No. 9.] (Evanston: Northwestern University. 1945. Pp. xi, 225. $4.00.)

The author's sub-title, "An Essay in the Recovery of Thought in Seventeenth Century England," reveals to readers unfamiliar with the history of political thought the field covered in this volume. And the tenor of her development is clearly indicated by the prefatory definition of a 'classical republican': "a person who advocated or admired a republic, and who took his ideas for such a government in whole or in part from the ancient masterpieces of political organization, their supposed modern counterparts, or their ancient and modern exponents."

In the conflict between king and parliament it was but natural that anti-monarchical aristocrats and members of the country gentry should cast about for models of republican government which they could adapt and present as vastly preferable alternatives to Stuart absolutism. Some strongly advocated the introduction of a mixed constitution and in their tracts and treatises marshalled a host of citations from the works of classical and Italian Renaissance political theorists to persuade contemporary Englishmen that a combination of the three "pure" forms of monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy afforded the best practical polity that human ingenuity could devise. In her opening chapter Miss Fink offers a brief but admirably lucid summary of the theories and demonstrations proposed by Aristotle, Cicero, Polybius, Machiavelli, and several less im-

portant writers. She then analizes the constitution of Venice, the supposed modern counterpart of republican Sparta and Rome. One of the author's most valuable contributions consists in the mass of evidence which she adduces to portray the surprisingly high reputation—in some cases amounting to fascination—which this "most serene republic" held in the minds of Tudor-Stuart Englishmen.

Because of his unquestioned pre-eminence in originality and influence, the first of the classical republicans to be treated is James Harrington whose political Utopia, *Oceana*, appeared in 1656. The underlying thought in his theory is that governmental stability is chiefly dependent upon the right distribution of property. Consistent with her purpose, however, Miss Fink subordinates this factor to more pertinent features such as his insistence on the Machiavellian principle (drawn from the *Discourses*) that good laws and not good men insure successful government and his repudiation of many English precedents in favor of Venice's allegedly mixed constitution, secret ballot, and rotation of offices. Due attention is likewise given to Harrington's appeal to his countrymen to embark on a career of world domination in imitation of ancient Rome's imperialism. Milton's complicated, doctrinaire, and somewhat shallow political theories, sprinkled through a number of tracts, are presented with as much clarity as the subject permits. That the Restoration did not kill republicanism but merely drove it into temporary sequestration is attested by the fact that several noteworthy adaptations of classical republicanism were published toward the close of the seventeenth century. The more prominent of these, Henry Nevill's *Plato Redivivus* and Algernon Sydney's *Discourses Concerning Government*, are studied in detail and a few of the minor treatises are briefly noticed.

While the author's self-imposed boundaries of discussion do involve unavoidable repetitions, her thorough grasp of the subject coupled with creditable facility in literary expression reduces monotony to a minimum. In most instances her employment of technical terminology is well-defended, clear, and consistent, the one exception being the term "sovereignty." She does not overrate her subjects; in fact, the amused detachment with which she points up their gullibility, conceit, and occasionally bald untruthfulness forms one of the attractive features of her work.

CLARENCE J. RYAN

Marquette University

From Despotism to Revolution, 1763-1789. By LEO GERSHOY, Sarah Lawrence College. [Rise of Modern Europe, edited by William L. Langer.] (New York: Harper and Bros. 1944. Pp. xvi, 355. $4.00.)

From Despotism to Revolution, like previously published volumes in

the Rise of Modern Europe, is written from the European rather than from the national point of view. It is an ambitious project, to give a political, economic, social, diplomatic, and intellectual cross-section of an entire continent during the years between the close of the Seven Years' War and the outbreak of the French Revolution. To produce his historical synthesis, Professor Gershoy has combed the more recent periodical and monographic material as well as the older standard works in a number of languages.

Two chapters sketch the rulers and governments as of 1763, along with the social classes in the various states. "Mandates of Security and Power," an analysis of the dominant political and economic theories at the start of the period—absolutism, mercantilism, cameralism, physiocratism—is the real heart of the volume, for the rest of the chapters simply depict in detail the modifications, both in theory and practice, of those dogmas. Stressing the rising political and economic importance of the upper middle classes and of "free industrial capitalism" (especially in France) as the agency of reform, Professor Gershoy paints the role of "enlightened despotism" as a bridge between the Ancien Régime and the era of the French Revolution. Its apogee was reached in eastern Europe, where Frederick II of Prussia, Catherine II of Russia, Maria Theresa and Joseph II of Austria most successfully turned the nobility, the landed and commercial aristocracy into servants of the state. These rulers, seeking at the same time to refashion the machinery of government and to improve the condition of their people, aimed to enhance their own power. They demanded the unquestioning loyalty of their subjects; their goal was "order" rather than "freedom." Yet, their statesmen, although harnessed to the service of the state, believed in "the obligations laid upon the sovereigns to promulgate by positive ordinances the natural and essential laws of social order," and said in effect to the rulers "that this was how monarchs should govern if their propertied subjects would allow them to govern at all." Thus the rulers, "the first servants of the state," were kept on the throne, but "in leading strings of purple." The aristocrats felt with Grimm that "the only remedy against the complexities of modern life and ever threatening anarchy lay in the genius and in the heart of him who had acquired the right to rule by birth." But they felt that the "legal despot" should be the instrument to usher in political and civil liberties. Thus, as Professor Gershoy puts it,

> . . . enlightened despotism dwelt in a strange no man's land, a border country still reminiscent of the familiar topography of the old regime absolutism, but verging on the new terrain of parliamentary constitutionalism.

The chapter on diplomatic relations makes use of recently-published material, but produces no especially new interpretations. The chapters,

"Of Human Welfare," "Literature and the Arts," "Faith, Hope and Charity in Secular Dress," range through the rise of humanitarianism, deism, the French *philosophes,* Febronianism, the suppression of the Jesuits, the ecclesiastic reforms of Joseph II, developments in education, poor relief, hospitals and asylums. These pages manifest a certain lack of sympathy with and understanding of many of the fundamental assumptions of Christianity. The chapter on literature and the arts, especially the section on music, is thin. The final chapter contrasts the politico-economic developments in England and in France in the 1780's, pointing out that, in England, the movement for political reform failed to loosen the stranglehold of the aristocracy and squirearchy over local political life, so that England had "constitutionalism for the benefit of the landlords and business aristocracy;" while in France, the upper bourgeoisie, failing to gain control of the existing governmental machinery, proceeded, in the French Revolution, "to establish under their own guarantees the political system and economic relations of capitalist democracy." Thus one comes again to Professor Gershoy's insistence on the decisive role of the upper bourgeoisie in the whole period from 1763 to 1789.

One might wish that the author's strong "liberal" convictions had not impelled him, in dealing with the *philosophes,* to gild the lily by obtruding his own point of view. In discussing John Locke, he makes gratuitous reference to what it pleases him to call the "long-faced theology of original sin." In treating Voltaire, he improves on that worthy by adding his own judgment that *"Voltaire got at the hard common sense of the matter* (italics, the reviewer's) when he wrote that God had endowed man with the reason in order to live well and not in order to penetrate into the essence of His being." Perhaps one ought not to suggest that when Professor Gershoy states that Joseph II, "in reducing religion to a function of the state, reflected that invincible hopefulness which gave high luster to the best of eighteenth-century thinking," he is expressing approval of one of the basic points of Nazi totalitarianism.

Like other volumes in the series, *From Despotism to Revolution* embodies a section of contemporary illustrations and a good index. The bibliographical essay is expertly done, the section on bibliographical aids being especially valuable. Although there are occasional flashes of satire and urbane humor, the volume does not make easy reading. In many matters, the author presumes a considerable body of knowledge of eighteenth-century history on the part of his readers. In short, it is hardly a volume for the layman. The scholar will find it a competent (if somewhat heavy) synthesis of the complex period just before the French Revolution.

FRANCIS A. ARLINGHAUS

University of Detroit

The Fall of the Old Colonial System. A Study in British Free Trade, 1770-1870. By ROBERT LIVINGSTON SCHUYLER. (New York: Oxford University Press. 1945. Pp. vii, 344. $3.00.)

Though the British Commonwealth of Nations is a twentieth-century achievement, there is an interesting similarity between the constitutional relations now existing between Britain and the self-governing dominions and the imperial ideas of certain British radicals of the eighteenth century. Prominent among the latter are John Cartwright, Granville Sharp, and Richard Price, all of whom were critical of the old colonial system without, however, wishing a total separation of the colonies from Great Britain. Cartwright's ideal of empire was a group of states, equal in status, with co-ordinate legislature and a common king. Granville Sharp suggested an association of the colonies and Great Britain in a free commonwealth, and Price's ideal was similar. From the standpoint of mercantilists, the advocates of such an empire were anti-imperialists, since equality of status was inconsistent with their conceptions of empire.

Other anti-imperialists, such as Adam Smith and Josiah Tucker, advocated total separation of the colonies from the mother country. Smith associated anti-imperialism with *laissez-faire* economics, but Tucker was not an advocate of *laissez-faire*. His anti-imperialism was based on his belief that colonial trade could not be controlled effectively, for colonies would trade with the mother country only if it was to their self-interest. Both were agreed that the colonies were a heavy burden with no adequate compensation. The majority of Englishmen, however, after the American Revolution, were not anti-imperialists, but "disappointed imperialists."

Following a discussion of the rise of anti-imperialism, the author considers the modifications of the old colonial system. Due to economic distress in England, the London merchants in 1820 presented a petition to the House of Commons protesting against trade restrictions. That started a political movement for commercial reform in the direction of free trade. The work of Huskisson, Peel, Grey, and Gladstone is especially important, and the author brings out clearly the relationship between free trade and other changes in the old colonial system. As Earl Grey wrote in 1853, the abandonment of the monopoly of trade made political control unnecessary. The withdrawal of imperial garrisons carried out by Gladstone was consistent with his view that the privileges and the burdens of freedom go together. Many in England felt that this meant hastening the disruption of the empire, but by diminishing the burdens of empire by withdrawing the garrisons, Gladstone and his colleagues removed the principal argument against maintaining the empire. Thus, they helped to prepare for the rise of the new imperialism.

This study of the old colonial system is limited to colonial commerce and defense, and is not concerned with administrative machinery or constitu-

tional issues. It includes a discussion of the imperial crisis of 1869-1870, and concludes with a review of the factors responsible for the survival of the empire. Professor Schuyler has limited his research to printed materials of which an extensive bibliography is given, including the parliamentary papers.

DORA J. GUNDERSON

Our Lady of the Lake College

The Méline Tariff: French Agriculture and Nationalist Economic Policy. By EUGENE OWEN GOLOB, Instructor in History, Columbia University. (New York: Columbia University Press. 1944. Pp. 266. $3.75.)

In the decade preceding the passage of the Méline tariff in 1892, French agricultural production and consumption continued to increase and the farming population to decrease just as they had in the years prior to 1880. Agricultural prices, however, which had, thanks to the relatively greater increase in the demand for farm products than in their supply, formerly shared in the general rise of prices, now commenced to fall off. Most disconcerting in this decline was that it was more pronounced in those products which had to compete with easily and cheaply transported agricultural imports. French agriculture, besides suffering from the great depression of 1873-1896, was ceasing to enjoy the natural protection "afforded by distance, poor means of transportation and lack of competitors." Would France under these conditions maintain a tariff structure which had benefited industry more than agriculture and so foster a more rapid industrialization of her society; or would she modify that structure so as to retard industrialization and maintain a more self-sufficient economy? Mr. Golob's study is an evaluation of the factors responsible for the enactment and an assessment of the results of that significant piece of legislation which inaugurated a policy of increased agricultural protection.

One factor contributing to this reorientation of French economic policy was the development of a national economic theory of which Paul-Louis Cauwès was the principal exponent. While his system reflected the marked influence of Friedrich List and Henry Carey, as well as that of the entire French protectionist tradition, it presented many original theses and was particularly adapted to modern French conditions. The frequency with which advocates of agricultural protection appealed to this national economic theory is evidence that it served not only as a *rationale* for the program which they advocated but that it also contributed to their own consolidation. The agencies most responsible for the campaign resulting in the passage of the Méline tariff were the *syndicats agricoles*, associations permitted by the law of 1884, federated into numerous unions,

and patronized by the Société des agricultures which consisted principally of the more distinguished landowners. The *syndicats,* many of them affiliated with and adhering to the doctrines of social Catholicism, were the channels through which pressure was brought upon candidates in the election of 1889 to espouse the cause of agricultural protection. Even more important in achieving final success was the prudent tactic on the part of the agrarians, principally rightist in politics, of entrusting the leadership of their movement to the republican agrarians, to whom in turn belongs the major credit for securing the co-operation of the industrial interests necessary to overcome the commercial elements in the large cities and the adherents of economic liberalism.

Despite this success, it is apparent that the policy of protection did not reverse any of the major nineteenth-century French agricultural trends. It did, however, in all probability, contribute to the retardation of the decline of French agricultural commodity prices, although this gauge of its effectiveness is not amenable to direct proof. The great value of this volume, replete as it is with statistics and excellent analyses thereof, is its portrayal of the French attitude toward national economic security in the post-1880 world. It merits the attention of those interested in the present recovery of France no less than the students of French history.

A. Paul Levack

Fordham University

Come over into Macedonia. By Harold B. Allen. (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press. 1943. Pp. xiii, 313. $3.00.)

Here is a book that will prove to be of deep and abiding interest in these war-spent days. It is a chronicle of how Harold B. Allen and his valiant co-workers of the American Near East Foundation strove, during the decade between 1928 and 1938, in company with Orthodox prelates, priests, and people to make over the land of Macedonia. We judge the work a valuable reprint for the future. Greece has been furrowed and flattened by the ruthless invader, and now, like many other countries, it must lie helpless and prostrate until American money and American ingenuity are once again applied to its multitudinous problems. It was the genius of Mr. Allen, highly equipped with an excellent background of the farm boy and the scholar, that he could preach effectively to the Greeks their age-old "gospel of the plow."

Right now we are confronted with the picture of a new migration of nations. Whole populations have been unseated, and it may never be possible for a vast number of people to return to their former homes. The same condition existed in Macedonia, during the years after the first World War. Destitute peoples, forced to flee Asia Minor, poured into the

land of Philip and Alexander. The Greek government and the Orthodox Church viewed the crisis and realised that the burden was too great. It was then that the various Near East agencies arose in our own country. First there was the Near East Relief and later the Near East Foundation. Supported by the accustomed magnanimity and usual generosity of the American citizenry, these agencies were able to send their trained personnel out into the field. Working on the principle, so well stated by Mr. Allen: "Direct relief must be as short as is humanly possible to make it," they have gone among the people to make their farm lands blossom once more and to make their homes centers of happiness and security.

The volume is by no means a dry story of what was accomplished. The author fascinates us with human interest stories and fine character sketches of priests and people. Through him, we walk into the homes of the people and rejoice in their pursuits. We gather in better playgrounds for the children and we see them better fed. Clinics, water fountains, walking libraries, and other improvements teach a down-trodden people to rise from utter wretchedness to renewed self-respect. All this was not accomplished by way of a dole. Although America gave much, it was never Mr. Allen's principle that it should give all. He went to Macedonia to make direct relief as short as is humanly possible and to teach the people to help themselves.

That is why we have called *Come over into Macedonia* a blueprint for the future. If the situation in Greece after World War I was tragic, the conditions there and everywhere at the present time are indescribable. Man's inhumanity to man has planted poverty and devastation in deepest furrows. Fortunately, early in the war, America prepared for her initial task of raising the almost mortally wounded peoples beyond the seas from the depths of despair. It will be left to the permanent agencies of relief and rehabilitation to carry on from there. Hope for a bright future will be based on the rich experiences of the past, as Mr. Allen portrays them. Our own Catholic Near East Welfare Association will be expected to meet a similar challenge. Although its aim is more specifically religious than that of the Near East Foundation, this Association, founded by Pope Pius XI for Russian and Balkan relief after World War I, is constantly receiving from Pius XII appeals for aid in relief. Its funds, distributed through the apostolic delegates and bishops of Near East countries, come from the generous hands of America's Catholics and they are carefully spent in uplifting the people who dwell in the cradle of Christianity. *Come over into Macedonia* is a title reminiscent of St. Paul's advent into the West, and it is now an Eastern call to us to preach the gospel to its poor.

THOMAS J. MCMAHON

Catholic Near East Welfare Association

The Spanish Labyrinth. By GERALD BRENAN. (New York: Macmillan Co. 1944. Pp. xviii, 384. $3.50.)

In this book, Mr. Brenan, an Englishman who has resided for lengthy periods in Spain, has endeavored to present an analysis of recent Spanish developments leading up to the revolution of 1936. The reason for writing the volume was the author's conviction that most recently-published works on Spain have been neither objective in approach nor sufficiently analytic in discussing the various and extremely complicated factors that have determined the course of events. The work is divided into three parts. The first deals with the period from 1874 to 1931; the second, discusses the conditions of the working classes, both agrarian and urban; the third, covers the period of the republic, 1931 to 1936. There is also a brief epilogue on the civil war, nine useful sketch maps, a chronological table of events, a lengthy annotated bibliography which indicates the thoroughness of the author's investigation, and an adequate index.

Mr. Brenan has succeeded, at least in part, in fulfilling his purpose. He has placed in proper focus the complicated factors in recent Spanish history by a skillful blending of chronological and descriptive narration. He has emphasized properly the provincial character of the Spanish people and of various social and political movements. His treatment of the agricultural problem and its political and economic effects is accurate and informative. In his treatment of the Church, however, while displaying considerable knowledge, he has attained neither accuracy nor objectivity.

His long residence in Spain, plus his reading of Spanish history, has given the author an appreciation of the Church not always evident in foreign writers. In his volume the work and influence of the Church are neither slighted nor underestimated. References to it are frequent. Seventeen pages are devoted to an account of the Church in Spain from the sixteenth century to the present time (pp. 39-55). Factually, this account, though necessarily sketchy, is accurate, but the selection of facts might in some instances be questioned as needless and removed from the general purpose of the book.

It is the opinion of the reviewer that the author's personal judgment on collective ownership of Spanish agricultural lands, his apparent lack of high regard of the value of organized religion in modern life, and his failure to analyze correctly the Church-State relationship, have led him into faulty judgments and a generally erroneous interpretation of the reasons for the decline of ecclesiastical influence in Spanish life. His treatment of the Church during the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, when both Spain and the Church were at the height of their achievement, is highly laudatory, yet accurate and well presented.

His handling of the decline of the Church after 1630 is misleading. It is true that the Church in Spain declined. It could not have done other-

wise. The political, economic, and social weaking of the nation could not fail to affect the Church. So Mr. Brenan's basic point is true—the Church in this period declined, both interiorally and in its influence on movements and events. What is wrong are some of the reasoning processes by which he arrives at this point. The length of this review makes impossible a detailed consideration of his argument. We can only note that the Church in Spain, as the nation itself, was exhausted by her supreme effort of the earlier period. As a convenient tool, she was used for political reasons by professed friends and made a scapegoat by her enemies. The course followed by the Spanish churchmen was dictated largely by necessity and the ideas of the times. While in many instances mistakes may have been made, the Church has survived as a major factor in Spanish life. Neither its friends nor its enemies have been able to destroy it.

To sum up, this work has much merit for its analysis of many movements and its description of many events. It is marred, however, by the author's subjectivity and, in regard to the Church, is actually misleading.

EDWARD J. MCCARTHY

Villanova College

AMERICAN HISTORY

The Quest of American Life. By GEORGE NORLIN. [University of Colorado Studies, Series B. Studies in the Humanities, Volume 2, No. 3.] (Boulder, Colorado: University of Colorado Press, 1945. Pp. xvi, 280.)

American life is a quest for freedom guided by an attitude of mind and heart which has faith in the dignity and worth of the human being and which strives to create a social climate wherein every human personality may flower and be fruitful. For want of a better word and because democracy has of late lost its meaning, Dr. Norlin calls this attitude of mind and heart American humanism. Despite deviations and snags from the periodic ascendency of greed and an unconcern for the common welfare, the quest for freedom has been continuous and progressive; its story is revealed in the words and works of the main protagonists: Roger Williams, the Quakers, Franklin, Jefferson, Jackson, Emerson, Whitman, Lincoln, and Theodore Roosevelt. Evidently no protagonist has appeared since the Square Deal, and at the close of the volume the hope is expressed that American humanism will survive the present crisis.

A book of this nature warrants the author considerable freedom and reactions, accordingly, will vary. With a mature understanding of our history and a sympathetic heart for the cause and his champions, the contribution of each (and much that will be found in college text books) is told in unaffected language. Quotations, at length and without references,

are used frequently. The Turner thesis that American humanism is largely derived from the forest and frontier has been accepted with a warning to be wary of its errors, but there is no evidence of any corrective. The volume is directed more to the general reader and the college student than to the professional historian. The study of Lincoln and slavery, "The Black Cloud," is exceedingly well done and by far, it seems to the reviewer, the best; that of Theodore Roosevelt, disappointing. The Populists never read his *Autobiography* and hence might well wonder when and with what success he "set his face with grim determination" (p. 266) to combat the captains and kings of industry.

Calvinism, we are told, prevented Puritanism from contributing much beyond an impetus to flee from its regime to the frontier. Yet Calvinism did not prevent Roger Williams from becoming "the first great humanist to set foot on American soil" (p. 7). We are told, too, not to be troubled when Walt Whitman tells us that God, man, and the pismire are in the same levels of values. But we should be troubled. Dr. Norlin himself fears that American humanism, the roots of our respect for the dignity of man, might not survive the present crisis. If it does not survive, the reason will not be found in the passing of the frontier; the dignity of the human personality was not acquired nor discovered in the forests. It will be because Americans have forgotten whence man has acquired his dignity and his inalienable rights; it will be because too many agree with Walt Whitman that God, man, and the pismire are on the same levels of values and that "nothing, not God, is greater to one than one's self is."

WILLIAM L. LUCEY

College of the Holy Cross

The Completion of Independence, 1790-1830. By JOHN A. KROUT and DIXON RYAN FOX. (New York: Macmillan Co. 1944. Pp. xxiii, 487. $4.00.)

This volume, the fifth in the History of American Life, completes the twelve-volume series spanning from the *Coming of the White Man* to 1928. Sponsored by the Macmillan Company, this series, written by outstanding scholars in the respective periods, under the editorship of Arthur Meier Schlesinger and the late Dixon Ryan Fox with Carl Becker as consulting editor, makes, indeed, a major contribution to the social history of the American nation. Although all the volumes are naturally not of equal worth, nor of the same school of interpretation, they are all scholarly and commendable. Their authors and editors are to be congratulated for the completion of such a great and worthy undertaking, which should remove forever the doubts of a few die-hard sceptics that the American nation does not possess a distinctive civilization. Few full-scale

American historical works are so rich in sound scholarship or command so many excellent sources. All students of American history are deeply indebted to this series which, as a series, pioneers in a field that had long been neglected.

Not many periods in our social history had been more neglected than that covered by Professors Krout and Fox in the *Completion Of Independence, 1790-1830.* And that neglect was all the more surprising in view of the fact that those years are among the most important. They were formative years significant not only in the formation of an overly-belligerent foreign policy of isolation, but even more so in the development of domestic procedure and internal growth. It was that period which witnessed the rise of the Atlantic ports, the Louisiana "bargain," the stretching of the highways beyond the Alleghenies and across the Appalachians, the digging of such major canals as the Erie, the first railroad, the growth of a partisan press, the awakening of nationalism, the times termed "the era of good feelings," and the start of new, meaningful sectional struggles. The country was at the time almost entirely agrarian and with the western expansion it began to feel the real impact of the frontier which was to clear the way for the rise of the common man.

On the social scale there was a wide differentiation between the lowly pioneer in his crude Kentucky cabin and that paradoxical figure, the aristocratic republican in Philadelphia and New York, whose culture certainly was not characteristic of the nation in the early decades of the nineteenth century. "Though the government was republican in form it was far from democratic in spirit. Its leaders with few exceptions were of the older school of English liberalism and they believed that the theories of 'the great Mr. Locke' had made clear the intimate connection between liberty and property. . . . In fact, this generation found it difficult to define the proper bounds of its republicanism" (pp. 150-151). With Eli Whitney's revolutionizing invention of interchangeable parts and its possibilities for mass production, the material achievements of the period surpassed by far the meager cultural advance. Culturally the country was scarcely independent. Despite low-priced imports factories made their appearance and American industry, encouraged by the War of 1812, waxed strong. Business in the full sense of the term began to flourish. Merchants and traders were steadily becoming less provincial. In a most readable fashion this volume portrays all these movements and accomplishments so well that it would be difficult to get a better panoramic view of the period.

The material and economic factors aided in the individualization of the period. They cast it into a definite mold and marked it as a period singular and apart from its predecessor, inasmuch as one historic era can be considered as distinct from its predecessor. But the truly individuating

note of that era seems to have been something less tangible than the material achievements mentioned above, something of the mind, which was in existence before the successful consummation of the War of Independence and which was to conserve the fruits of that fortunate conflict viz., the philosophy predominating through these years in the western democracy. This philosophy had many variations but it possessed one saving, fundamental characteristic: conservatism. The conservative tradition was sufficiently perduring and persistent to prevent any attack of liberalism from pulling the majority of the country far from the center. It seems to have been this salutary note that from 1790-1830 really enabled the infant nation to profit from its victory by avoiding the excesses of a liberalism run rampant as they occurred in France during these years. Briefly, conservatism enabled the nation to complete its independence. The chapters on the "Challenge of Liberal Thought" and the "Conservative Tradition," are among the best in the volume. But the great benefits accruing from that timely, almost reactionary conservatism did seem to escape the authors. This might, of course, be merely a question of emphasis.

Another point which also might be only a question of emphasis, but which may be appropriate for readers of this REVIEW, pertains to the treatment of the Catholic Church in the volume. While it is true that the great growth of the Catholic Church in the United States did not start until a decade after the years covered by Krout and Fox, in 1808 there were thought to be sufficient Catholics to warrant the erection of separate dioceses in Bardstown, Boston, New York, and Philadelphia. In 1829 for the convocation of the First Provincial Council of Baltimore there were nine suffragan sees and an estimated Catholic population of half a million. It seems to the reviewer that in the Krout-Fox work too little space was given to this section of the population and to their Church. Slight as was the influence of the Catholic Church in the new republic during those years, it would deserve greater mention than it receives.

Furthermore, although the War of Independence was the occasion for an amelioration of religious conditions for Catholics in the United States and there was a lull in violent outbursts of bigotry, nevertheless there was not the perfect peace and harmony for American Catholics nor the enjoyment of the full civil liberty that the silence of the authors might lead the reader to suppose. Because of the limitation of space only two works can be cited for substantiation: Guilday, *The Life and Times of John Carroll* and the recently-published *History of the Archdiocese of Boston.* The latter work treats of a region which was dealt with rather fully in the volume under review. Both Guilday and the Boston *History* show that the Catholic question was far from dead in 1790.

Since mention was made of missionary societies supported by Ameri-

icans for the conversion of foreign lands (pp. 253 ff), it would have been more complete if mention was also made of the assistance given by foreign missionary societies to the American churches. This would have explained some of the old-country ties and some of the endeavors of foreign rulers to exert influence in this country. The authors have wisely observed that "the tragedy of the Catholic Church in Europe became a blessing for its isolated missions in America, since the French Revolution drove many priests from their own country" (p. 252). But no notice is taken of the healthy reaction from liberalism that these French priests, many of whom rose to influential positions in the Church in America, brought to this country and instilled into their congregations. In the overall picture these, of course, are only picayune flaws.

Purists, perhaps, might lift an eyebrow at such expressions as "more true" (pp. 9, 409), "further down" (p. 20), "more dense" (p. 123). A few capitalizations were also missed, e. g., "piedmont" (p. 85). These minor slips are more than offset by the excellent thirty-three page "Critical Essay On Authorities." This essay, which constitutes the last chapter, is definitely a contribution to the historiography of the period. Historiography is not the precise term, for the more important non-literary remains of the generation concerned are listed as well as the documents of literary sources. The twenty some divisions of the essay are clear-cut and unusually complete. They range from general accounts to specific work on such an item as sports. The caption "religious trends" has five sub-divisions. It might well have included under one of these Guilday's *Life and Times of John England,* also the same author's *History of the Councils of Baltimore, 1791-1884,* which contains an excellent summary of American Catholic history for the period in the early chapters.

Aside from the flaws noted, most of which are of a minor nature, this volume will take a leading place, even in such an outstanding series as the American Life. Finally, the book has a copious, well thought-out index.

HUGH J. NOLAN

St. James High School
Chester, Pennsylvania

Democracy in America. By ALEXIS DE TOCQUEVILLE. Two Volumes. Henry Reeve text as revised by Francis Bowen and edited with notes by Phillips Bradley. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 1945. Pp. cix, 434, xii; xiii, 401, x. $6.00.)

If familiarity with Tocqueville were required of every foreign critic writing about America, probably fewer but better books would result. It is hard to believe that the first section of *Democracy in America* appeared 110 years ago; much of it might have been written within the past

year, so applicable is it. Alfred A. Knopf deserves mention in this review for having printed this new edition, with its unhackneyed introduction by Phillips Bradley, and its illuminating and lengthy series of appendices and editorial notes.

Tocqueville did much more than study the penal system in America, as he was commissioned to do by the French government during his stay in this country from May, 1831, to February, 1832. He knew what he wanted to write in his projected work on America: "I wished to show what a democratic people really was in our day. . . . To those who have fancied an ideal democracy . . . I endeavored to show that they had clothed the picture in false colors . . . and moreover that such a government cannot be maintained without certain conditions of intelligence, of private morality, and of religious belief that we, as a nation [France] have not reached, and that we must labor to attain before grasping their political results" (I, xx). Here we have the young aristocrat of the France of Louis Philippe endeavoring to approach objectively a culture different from that of his native country, and at the same time attempting to tell his compatriots of the aspects of American culture which France might well adapt for her own use.

It is true that the second volume, analyzing the social influence of democracy, was less esteemed than the first one, which discussed the machinery and techniques of American government. The second volume was more abstract and speculative than its predecessor. Both volumes have been used at times to bolster opposite points of view. Conservatives have used Tocqueville's phrases to justify the claimed superiority of aristocratic principles and institutions; liberals have used other phrases to justify their arguments in favor of a broader suffrage. Such use of his material makes it appear that Tocqueville was impartial, rather than inconsistent.

One of the most controversial issues in his writings is found in his attitude toward the power of the political majority in the American system of government. Some have read into his statements a fear of a tyrannical group; others see only a recognition of a simple but not necessarily threatening fact. Such statements as: "The people reign in the American political world as the Deity does in the universe. They are the cause and aim of all good things; everything comes from them, and everything is absorbed in them" (I, 58), and also, "The Americans hold that in every state the supreme power ought to emanate from the people, but when once that power is constituted, they can conceive, as it were, no limits to it, and they are ready to admit that it has the right to do whatever it pleases" (II, 290), might give the impression that Tocqueville saw in American government the possibilities of mob rule, but many other statements stress his belief in an orderly democracy.

Noteworthy, too, is his analysis of American political parties. He reveals an attachment to the principles of the old Federalist party, but sensibly admits that it had given way to a more desirable political order (I, 176-177). The nation in the early 1830's was so completely under the control of Jackson that Tocqueville believed that political parties as such had disappeared. His discussion on the liberty of the press is as applicable today as when he penned it (I, 181); possibly no one has ever written more clearly on the respective merits of democratic and aristocratic government (I, 238); he saw no conflict between Catholicism and Americanism (II, 29); the restlessness and prosperity of America were ably evaluated (II, 138-139).

Literally dozens of crisp phrases cry for quotation. No matter how often encountered, Tocqueville's statements never become trite or tiresome. It is encouraging to realize that this observant Frenchman's confidence in the America of a century ago has been justified by her subsequent history.

PAUL KINIERY

Loyola University
Chicago

Florida During the Territorial Days. By SIDNEY WALTER MARTIN, Associate Professor of History in the University of Georgia. (Athens: University of Georgia Press. 1944. Pp. ix, 308. $3.00.)

This colorful period of Florida's history is for the first time comprehensively treated in Dr. Martin's book. It is one of deep interest to the student of United States history, for here he is able to observe the tide of that great movement known as "manifest destiny" engulf and assimilate East and West Florida so completely that within twenty-four years there remained hardly a trace of the former Spanish heritage. To Andrew Jackson largely is due the credit for the remarkable speed with which the Americanizing process took place. He dealt with the Spanish, whom he disliked anyway, in his usual rough way so that "within three months' time Jackson turned Florida toward the American way of life." The Old Warrior's tenure of office as first (military) governor of Florida lasted only a year. His harsh treatment of the Spanish officials had caused him serious trouble, and when he resigned, the threat of a congressional investigation into his conduct was about to break over his head. Professor Martin sums up Jackson's contribution in this way: "Probably his greatest contribution to Florida was the stern methods he used in dealing with the Spanish. Had he not used such methods, Spanish customs, habits, and traditions would probably be much stronger in Florida today than they are."

But the Americanizing process went on throughout the territorial

period, extending from February 22, 1821, when the Adams-Onis Treaty was ratified for the second time by the Senate (first ratification, February 24, 1819) to March 3, 1845, when Florida, along with Iowa, was admitted as a state. Politically the change was recorded by the rise of the American politician of the Jacksonian brand; economically it was recorded in the mushrooming of little "boom towns" and "cotton ports" in what was known as Middle Florida; socially it was marked by the almost simultaneous emigration of the Spanish citizenry and the rapid immigration of territorial American pioneers; religiously it was noted in the rise of Protestantism and the decline of Catholicism. The handful of Spanish left behind in St. Augustine and Pensacola were without priests while along with the pioneer came the circuit-riding missionary.

On the political side the whole territorial period, with the exception of four years, was dominated by three of Jackson's satellites: William P. Duval, the first civil governor, who served for five terms (1822-1834), John H. Eaton (1834-1836), and Richard Keith Call (1836-1839 and 1841-1844). These men served the interests of Andrew Jackson and were generally unpopular. The acquisition of Florida gave a vast new area of public land to the federal government with which it hoped to liquidate the five million dollars in claims of its own citizens against Spain. This process was greatly complicated by previous Spanish land grants which had to be settled first. Then, too, the Seminole Indians were reluctant to give up their lands and they did not hesitate to wage a real war (1835-1842). The liberal policies of the United States Land Office greatly speeded up the Americanizing process.

Chapters which focus attention on some of the other territorial problems are: Internal Improvements, which discusses the first attempts at road building, the railroads, and banking; Frontier Towns; and Beginnings of Protestant Religion and Education. Dr. Martin's record of this Americanizing process in territorial Florida is objective, without prejudice, and a true history.

CHARLES W. SPELLMAN

Berkeley, California

The Territorial Papers of the United States. Compiled and Edited by CLARENCE EDWIN CARTER, Ph.D. Volume XII, *The Territory of Michigan, 1829-1837.* (Washington: Government Printing Office. 1945. Pp. vii, 1378. $4.50.)

Michigan has never known a more stirring time than the years closing her long territorial tutelage. The increase of population and the expansion of settlements necessitated the establishment of eleven new counties in 1829. Countless memorials to Congress prayed government assistance for internal improvements within the territory commensurate with this

expansion. In common with all territories, Michigan looked forward "with ardour to that political change" which would terminate her territorial status and inaugurate her "independent condition." To this end the legislative council memorialized Congress on January 7, 1833. In the previous October the people of the territory had signified their desire for statehood, hence the memorialists prayed Congress to pass the required enabling act for Michigan. A second issue which, with that of statehood, was to make Michigan history for half a decade concerned the southern boundary to which both Ohio and Indiana laid claim. Basing her rights on previous acts of Congress, Michigan struggled bravely, but unsuccessfully, against her stronger neighbors.

Stevens Thomson Mason, Secretary and Acting Governor, directed Michigan's course through the trying last years of her territorial existence. Although President Jackson's appointment of this outsider, who was not yet twenty years old and inexperienced, brought a storm of protest from citizens of the territory, nevertheless, the manner in which he managed her affairs won for him, in time, the full approval of the people. This they signified by electing him to the highest office in the new state.

In his address to the legislative council on September 1, 1834, Acting Governor Mason after calling attention to the failure of Congress to pass an enabling act for the territory, concluded that the time had arrived when Michigan was called upon "to act for herself." The council agreed and proceeded to implement this decision. By October, 1835, a state government was in operation. On November 9, the legislature of the new State of Michigan apprised Congress of the work accomplished and asked for admission to the Union.

Meanwhile the boundary dispute continued. Mason made a detailed report of the problem together with Ohio's compromise offer to the legislative council on August 17, 1835. His zeal for what he deemed the rights of Michigan had, however, in the opinion of the President, exceeded the "spirit of moderation and forbearance" necessary for peace, hence, the latter considered it necessary to remove him from office. Jackson, refusing to recognize the governmental changes that had been effected in Michigan, appointed a new secretary of the territory.

Statehood and the boundary problem were made a joint issue in the long debate in Congress with the resulting decision that Michigan's entrance into the Union would be conditioned upon her acceptance of the loss of the Toledo strip to Ohio and the addition of the Upper Peninsula to her domain. The convention of assent which met in September, 1836, rejected the boundary changes. Pressure from many quarters forced a second convention to accept them, and, on January 26, 1837, Michigan lost her anomalous character of a "sovereign state out of the Union."

The careful selection of documents included in this third volume of the

territorial papers of Michigan provides a rich additional source for the study of one of the most interesting periods of the history of the state.

SISTER M. ROSALITA KELLY

Marygrove College

John Dooley, Confederate Soldier: His War Journal. Edited by JOSEPH T. DURKIN, S.J., Professor of American History, Georgetown University. Foreword by Douglas Southall Freeman. (Washington, D. C.: Georgetown University Press. 1945. Pp. xxiii, 244. $3.00.)

John Dooley was a student at Georgetown College when the Civil War commenced. At nineteen he enlisted as a private in the famous First Virginia Regiment, C. S. A., in 1862. Eleven months later, as a captain, he was wounded and captured in Pickett's Charge at Gettysburg and thereby ended his combat career. His war diary begins with the second Manassas campaign and carries through to May, 1865. In September of the latter year he entered the Jesuit novitiate at Georgetown, but died in 1873, a few months short of his ordination.

Much of the diary was written from contemporary notes, while Dooley was a prisoner at Johnson's Island in Lake Erie, and it reflects something of the bitterness of the prison camp in addition to the usual partisan feelings common to belligerent peoples. Primarily it is a record of personal emotions and experiences, rather than an account of the campaigns themselves.

Like most writers on the Civil War, Dooley advanced a reason for the fall of the Confederacy: the Union army had too many Irishmen. "If their strong and fearless hearts had not leagued with oppression to destroy us, all the hireling Germans and money-loving Puritans . . . could never have . . . plucked from the manly brows of our citizens their wreaths of freedom . . ." Ironically the possibility is strong that Dooley was hit by a minie ball fired by one of Colonel Dennis O'Kane's Irish lads of the 69th Pennsylvania.

As a source book of general information on the Civil War several passages are noteworthy. Punishments such as "bucking" and "gagging" are frequently mentioned in the literature of the period but they are rarely explained as clearly as in this diary. In this connection the disciplinary problems of the Confederate army are aptly illustrated. Other accounts of acute suffering in the overloaded and poorly-manned field hospitals are here confirmed, as Dooley, shot through both thighs, received no professional attention (except to have a questionnaire filled out by a surgeon!) for six days. The description of life in the Union prison camp at Johnson's Island, and of the experiences of prisoners enroute, is vivid.

Father Durkin, editor of the diary, has supplied adequate footnotes and

has arranged the narrative with coherence. His comments add greatly to the reader's understanding and enjoyment of the diary.

A few editorial statements of questionable accuracy or clarity were noted. Jackson did not march northwestward and then northeastward from Manassas to attack Harpers Ferry (p. 26), but crossed the Potomac with Lee, passed through Frederick and thence through Boonsboro, Williamsport, and Martinsburg. It was the absence of Jackson's corps and of McLaws' and R. H. Anderson's division of Longstreet's corps at Harpers Ferry (p. 32) that endangered the Confederates rather than the separation of D. H. Hill from Longstreet. McLaws was on Maryland Heights, southeast of Sharpsburg, when Lee withdrew from South Mountain and was expected to march northwestward, whereas the editor places him "above" Sharpsburg marching northeastward (p. 39). It was not Hooker's corps that was trapped in the famous pocket at Antietam (p. 43), but Sedgwick's division of Sumner's corps.

The diarist modestly minimizes the distance traversed by Pickett's Charge. It was about three-fourths rather than one-third of a mile (p. 105). Pickett was not personally leading his men thirty yards from the guns as Dooley states (p. 106), but stopped in the rear where a division commander belonged, in this case, in all probability near the Emmitsburg road. There were no North Carolina troops moving on Pickett's right as is indicated on page 102. Dooley probably referred to Wilcox's Alabama brigade or Perry's Florida brigade of Anderson's division, Hill's corps. The North Carolinians were on Pickett's left.

In the appendix the editor recounts John Dooley's later years, from 1865 until his death. He also includes a highly interesting brief narrative of the history of the First Virginia Regiment from colonial times to the present.

J. WALTER COLEMAN

Gettysburg, Pennsylvania

Woodrow Wilson and the People. By H. C. F. BELL. (New York: Doubleday, Doran and Co., Inc. 1945. Pp. 384. $3.00.)

A second World War and a new League of Nations have stimulated more and more interest in Woodrow Wilson and world peace, in wars to end wars. Ray Stannard Baker, unfortunately, did not finish his monumental biography, so there remains plenty of opportunity for original studies and fresh interpretations of Wilson and his efforts for world peace. Two recent critical ones by Thomas A. Bailey have stressed in quick vernacular the mistakes of the war President while leaving an incidental impression of his greatness. Professor Bell in more stately language champions the "indestructible greatness" of Wilson, but a scrupulous muse forces him to acknowledge with seeming reluctance the great man's many

political errors. He claims nothing new for this latest study, except an interpretation, at least a fresh emphasis, of Wilson's political career in relation to his reliance on the people always to support him in the way he wished to guide them; on the people not only of his own country but also of the whole world. As a professor, as a writer on political theory, and a university president, Wilson had shown little interest in the people, but as a politician he staked his all on them to uphold him even against their own governments, including the government of the United States in all but its executive branch. The tragedy of Wilson's personal life, as the author points out impressively, was that he could not keep friends whom he could not command intellectually. The tragedy of his political career, a tragedy which could be thrown into even higher relief in Professor Bell's admirable little biography, is that Wilson, who thought he knew the people so well, never really understood them and never really had their full support, not in the United States, much less in the world at large. He could not make them follow where he wanted to tutor them and lead them. They finally repudiated him on all fronts. They proved less loyal than those much-tried personal friends whom he ceased to see when no longer they could agree.

On the jacket Mr. Bell explains that he has written his book not for scholars, not for politicians, not for the rich and not for the poor, but just for all the people who might be interested to know about a great President. But his own scholarly objectivity and propensities make it difficult for him in such a short book to deal with details and problems that always hover about the scholar. He ends up by being interesting but tantalizing to the scholar, doubtless very provoking to the politician, and a little over the heads of the people, rich and poor, just like Woodrow Wilson himself, Professor Bell's predecessor at Wesleyan.

SAMUEL FLAGG BEMIS

Yale University

NOTES AND COMMENTS

The end of the war came too late to enable the members of the Committee on Program of the American Catholic Historical Association to insure a first-class meeting. Professor Tschan and his colleagues are, therefore, directing their efforts to the meeting in December, 1946. Meanwhile the Association is making plans to hold a luncheon conference in Washington in late December for the transaction of its annual business for 1945. The American Historical Association on September 20 informed its members that an abbreviated meeting for business purposes would be held in Washington on December 27.

The perennial discussion of the growth of the Catholic Church in the United States usually centers on the number of Catholic immigrants who have lost the Faith as compared with those who have remained faithful and have given sons and daughters to the present prosperous organization. The outstanding study on the question has been made by the Most Reverend Gerald M. Shaughnessy, S.M., in *Has the Immigrant Kept the Faith?* This study, like many others, however, does not pay too close attention to the number of converts and to their children. In the more settled sections of the country there do not seem to have been so many converts as there were along the frontier. Bishop Benedict Joseph Flaget wrote several times that the friendliness of the non-Catholic pioneers in his vast frontier diocese was very real. He felt that he could have brought nearly all of them into the Church if he had had a sufficient number of priests. Bishops Bruté and Hailandière of Vincennes spoke in the same way about the conversions in Indiana. Bishop Bruté in his report to Rome in 1836 laid great emphasis on the contribution of these converts to the growth of the Church. A careful study of the actual number of these converts and of their children is a necessary step in further delineating the problem of gains and losses in the United States. It is noteworthy that there have been converts in every walk of life.

Quite frequently in articles and books on the Church's attitude on social and economic questions the American hierarchy has been criticized for not taking a more pointed stand in matters of public reform. This criticism does not say that the American bishops have ever condoned any wrongful practice; the point of criticism is the apparent lack of positive leadership. Most of these critics are seemingly unaware of the great efforts made by the bishops of the country to avoid mixing in politics. Undoubtedly matters of political importance were discussed in every council of Baltimore from 1829 to 1884. But one looks in vain for any statement of the bishops about

the government or the relation between religion and government in the *Acta et decreta*. Occasionally there is a monition that Catholics must give proper allegiance and service to their country or a suggestion that the persecutions of the Church during the earlier nativist riots were contrary to the rights of Catholics as American citizens. A further illustration of this attitude can be had from the fact that across the top of the first Catholic weekly newspaper, the *United States Catholic Miscellany*, Bishop John England, the editor, printed the words of the first amendment against an establishment of religion by the government.

Quite frequently the appointment of a priest to an administrative position or his elevation to the episcopate takes away from literature or history a very promising worker. Bishop Camillus Maes of Covington was just such a promising writer whose later life was taken up chiefly with the duties of his growing diocese. His personal papers, now preserved at St. Anne's Convent, Melbourne, Kentucky, show him to have maintained a constant interest in intellectual matters and a desire to do more for the spread particularly of historical studies. Besides his own contributions in the form of books and essays he fostered historical work at the Catholic University of America and was interested in scholarship generally. These activities, added to erection of his beautiful cathedral, and his fostering of the public devotion to the Eucharist especially through the Priests Eucharistic League, mark him as a very deserving subject for historical study.

Although several short studies of individual newspapers have been made, with the exception of the accounts of Paul J. Foik, C.S.C., and Apollinaris Baumgartner, O.F.M.Cap., no attempt at a broad study of the American Catholic press has been made. A complete study, when it is made, must include foreign language newspapers as well as English papers and must include also some that scarcely deserve the name Catholic. In the meantime, while scholars are awaiting this detailed study, a much-needed instrument for research is an adequate listing of the holdings in public and private repositories of these Catholic newspapers. The files of some of these newspapers are not listed in any known guides, though their existence is well known. There are many Catholic libraries and societies with copies and even volumes of important Catholic publications that have made no efforts to list these holdings for the public. Some of the larger libraries have done their part, but their incomplete files would become even more valuable if the holders of short runs and incomplete files would make their lists available.

A correction is necessary in the article "American Contributions to the Catholic Missionary Effort in China in the Twentieth Century," which

appeared in the July issue of the REVIEW (Vol. XXXI). On page 171 the author refers to a small donation made to the Society for the Propagation of the Faith in 1883 and a promise made in 1884 as the turning point for American interest in the missions. Actually the donation of $6.00 referred to was made in 1833 and not in 1883. It would seem better to connect the turning point for the missions with the zeal of the bishops at the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore rather than with an individual promise of Cardinal Gibbons (Cf. Hickey, *The Society for the Propagation of the Faith*). It is indeed correct to say that in 1888 "the United States gave to the Society a sum which was larger by $10,000 than the amount received from the Society for that year," but a careful survey of the next ten years will not show the same proportion. The real growth in the contributions to the Society occurred when Father Granjon, later, bishop of Tucson, was put in charge in 1897, and particularly from 1900 to 1924, under the directorship of Father Freri, later, vicar apostolic of Athabasca. It would also be more nearly correct to assert that two-thirds of the first year's (1822) total contributions to the Society were sent to the United States, rather than "more than half of the total." The amount of the contributions sent to the United States in the period 1822-1922 would have to be reduced by one million dollars if the territorial possessions are excluded.

In November, 1923, Professor Henry K. Rowe of the Newton Theological Institution, asked his former teacher, Dr. J. Franklin Jameson, to read some chapters of a manuscript he had finished (evidently his *History of Religion in the United States,* 1924), and to give his "frank judgment" of what he had written. The following are excerpts from Jameson's letter on the subject, December 18, 1923:

> . . . While you have taken everywhere a broad view, it is natural for you to have the Baptist and Congregationalist denominations a little more in mind than some of the others, yet I do not think that I have noticed this in respect to any of the Protestant denominations, unless at possibly one or two points with the Episcopalians; but I do think that, especially in chapter V., you have not sufficiently had in mind the missionary efforts of the Catholics. This is a very usual omission among Protestant writers on the history of religious work in America. I have seen books on the history of missions from which one would never gather that Christianity in the West, either among Indians or white men, owed anything serious to Catholic labors. Now the fact is that, for nearly two hundred years after the Reformation, nearly all the missionary activity displayed in the Christian body was that of the Catholic Church, the other churches being too exclusively national organizations to think much of such things; and in this country, the efforts of John Eliot and the Mayhews, which is about all that American Puritanism has to show, is hardly a drop in the bucket compared

to what the Catholics were doing at that time. I dare say you are familiar with such books as those about Father De Smet, or the Reports of the Leopoldine Association, or Father Dilhet's *État*, ed. Browne, and the various other books that are mentioned in the first six (American) volumes of the *Catholic Historical Review*, but such knowledge does not show out adequately in your narrative. If you have to read up on the subject, I imagine that the article "Missions" in the *Catholic Cyclopedia* provides at the end a short-cut to the literature. . . .

If you have anything to say of Catholic missions, your point about the necessary deflection of the missionary activities from frontier regions to cities has great emphasis in that denomination. Down till after the Civil War, the Catholic missionary (to whites) found his chief occupation in gathering together, or reaching and confirming in their faith, wandering sheep of the flock who had more or less isolated themselves on farms and elsewhere. The enormous Catholic immigration of the last thirty years, Italian and Slavonic, has gone to the cities or engaged in our industrial rather than our agricultural life, so that there is a difference of the local direction of home missionary work, besides that difference of race and language which strikes the eye when one sees a Polish inscription on a fine new Catholic Church in Northampton, Massachusetts, or a multitude of Slavic names in a list of clergy in the provinces of St. Paul, Milwaukee, and Chicago. . . .

The history of the chaplains in the present war will contain records of many new activities. Chaplains now undergo regular military and naval training. They must observe complete military discipline. The nature of modern warfare, with its air battles, its amphibious and paratrooper operations, and jungle campaigns, has placed a heavy task on the chaplain merely to keep up physically with the fighting units. Discipline has necessarily eliminated them from many activities not necessarily associated with chaplaincies. This strictness is in sharp contrast to the status of chaplain in our other wars. In the Civil War one of the great services rendered by at least several Catholic chaplains was to carry the money of the soldiers of their regiments either to banks or to relatives at home. Two outstanding examples of this kind of service were the activities of Father Peter Paul Cooney, C.S.C., with the Army of the Cumberland, and of Father William Corby, C.S.C., of Gettysburg fame. Among the papers of Father Cooney are lists of the soldiers and the amounts of pay that he handled for them. Father Corby preserved letters of the soldiers making claim after the war for money that had been entrusted to him in battle. His chief bank for deposits of this kind was the Emigrant Bank of New York.

The Bulletinarius, issued ten times a year from Saint Joseph's Seminary, Dunwoodie, Yonkers, New York, has entered upon its second

volume. This ten-page mimeographed news-letter is a familiarly written summary of the activities of the alumni of the seminary now serving as chaplains in the various branches of the armed forces.

The American Irish Historical Society has received the 7000-volume library of W. Bourke Cockran along with $10,000 under the will of Mrs. Cockran, who died on January 7.

A ninety-six-page mimeographed bibliography entitled, "A Select Bibliography of the History of the Catholic Church in the United States," has been compiled by the Managing Editor of the REVIEW. Students interested in this work can secure copies for $1.00 by writing to the REVIEW office.

Volume XXXIV of the *Historical Records and Studies* of the United States Catholic Historical Society contains the address of Professor Charles C. Tansill delivered before the annual meeting of the society on November 17, 1944, on the subject, "The Plan of Pope Benedict XV for a Just and Lasting Peace." It tells the dreary story of how the efforts of the Pope were frustrated by the statesmen in both camps who were intent that their own interpretation of peace be accepted. The volume likewise contains two dissertations for the Master of Arts degree, that of Sister Bernetta Brislen on "The Episcopacy of Leonard Neale, Second Archbishop of Baltimore," done at the Catholic University of America, and "The Constitution and the Declaration," by Arthur F. Nugent of Cardinal Hayes High School, which was presented at Fordham University.

The National Archives announces that it has available for distribution to libraries, universities, and research institutions surplus copies of printed and near-print material produced by the National Recovery Administration and received by the National Archives with the records of the Administration. This material is of exceptional value for the study of all phases of American economic conditions not only for the period of 1933-37 but for antecedent periods as well (e.g., "codes of fair competition, collections of economic data made in the course of research and planning activities, *Report of the President's Committee of Industrial Analysis*".) Copies of these materials or information about them may be obtained by writing to the General Reference Division of the National Archives, Washington 25, D. C. Copies will be distributed in response to requests, insofar as the supply permits, until January 1, 1946. Lists of the more important materials are also available.

Department of State publication 2349, Conference Series 71, is a 266-

page *Report to the President on the Results of the San Francisco Conference* by Edward R. Stettinius, Jr. (United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C.) June 26, 1945.

"Projects in American History and Culture" by a Committee of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association appeared in the March issue of the *Review* of that Association and has been circulated in reprints. Anyone working in the field of American history should not fail to see it. The distinguished committee, of which Louis Pelzer of the University of Iowa was chairman, intends to stress the need of investigating subjects that have pertinence for our times. It believes in the need for historical interpretation. No one will be surprised at the projects suggested, but they are indeed an enticing array. The graduate student will be at once comforted and bewildered at his choice. It is irritating to find a number of authorities and "students" quoted or referred to without identification. A quotation in the brief section devoted to religion one is tempted to recall as being from De Tocqueville. Much water has since passed through the mill. The beginnings of the report read well, but the later presentation descends at times to a very low level. The recommendations at the end are sober and practical.

The July number of the *Review of Politics* has articles on the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt by Thomas McAvoy, M. A. Fitzsimons, and John A. Ryan.

In the June number of the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* O. Fritiof Ander describes an American-studies major according to the New Augustana Plan.

The German surrender documents signed at Lüneburg, Rheims, and Berlin have been placed on exhibit at the National Archives. Facsimiles of them will soon be available as a publication of the National Archives and will be offered for sale by the Superintendent of Documents.

The 368-page *Report, 1943-1944* of both the English and the French sections of the Canadian Catholic Historical Association has been published. The papers are listed in our Periodical Literature. The 1945 meeting of the Association was held at Toronto on September 25 and 26.

The following lectures on Latin America were held at the Catholic University of America during the summer: "The Spiritual Background of Ibero-America" by Professor Americo Castro of Princeton University; "The Attack on Tradition in Brazil" by Professor Manoel da Silveira Soares Cardozo of the Catholic University of America; "The Religious

Art of Latin America" by Professor Robert C. Smith of Sweet Briar College; "How Catholic Is Latin America?" by the Reverend Dr. James A. Magner of the Catholic University of America; "An Editor's Eye-View of Latin-American Historiography" by Professor John Tate Lanning of Duke University; "The Influence of Land Ownership in Argentine Culture" by Dr. Carl Taylor of the United States Department of Agriculture; "Latin America and the Industrial Age" by Dr. George Wythe of the United States Department of Commerce; "Recent Developments in the Inter-American System: Chapultepec and San Francisco" by Professor Arthur Preston Whitaker of the University of Pennsylvania.

This highly successful series was held under the auspices of the office of the Director of the Summer Session of the Catholic University of America, the Office of Inter-American Affairs, and the Institute of Ibero-American Studies of the Catholic University of America. Arrangements for the lectures were made by Mr. Cardozo in his capacity as secretary of the Institute of Ibero-American Studies.

The National Catholic Welfare Conference announces that an Inter-American Seminar on Social Problems will be held in Havana, January 2-9.

The Seventh annual Congreso Mexicano de Historia is scheduled to be held at Guanajuato, Gto., September 16-22. The program lists a rich and varied series of papers on Mexican history.

A new Oñate manuscript has recently been found in the Mexican National Archive and is to be published by that institution in co-operation with the University of New Mexico.

Leopoldo Zea, the author of a recent study on Positivism in Mexico, has been granted a fellowship for the purpose of preparing a work on Positivism in other Latin-American countries. Sr. Zea is presently in South America.

The impressive Cathedral of Mexico City, the largest edifice of its kind in the New World, is now undergoing extensive repairs. Plans have also been made for the construction of a building, adjoining the rear of the church, for the cathedral's museum. It is hoped that in the building some provision will be made for the cathedral's archives.

Vol. 55 (1944), nos. 10-12 of *Memorias y Revista de la Academia Nacional de Ciencias* (Mexico) devotes three articles to the life and influence of Copernicus.

W. Stanford Reid, who has an article in this issue of the REVIEW, contributes "The Scottish Counter-Reformation before 1560" to the June number of *Church History*. Conciliar legislation was aimed especially at clerical incontinence and ignorance. But the clergy refused to reform their lives, and the very catechism published to remedy ignorance deviated from orthodoxy. It is especially noteworthy that this catechism omitted all reference to papal authority.

Father E. A. Ryan, S.J., has a judicious nine-page review of Trevor Gervase Jalland's *The Church and the Pope: a Historical Study* in the June number of *Theological Studies*.

The Reverend E. W. Kemp's essay "Pope Alexander III and the Canonization of Saints," which won the Alexander Prize last year, appears in the *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, Fourth Series, Volume XXVII (1945). He shows that at the accession of Pope Alexander III the control of bishops over canonizations in their dioceses, prescribed by a few old enactments of canon law, was still recognized. There existed a widespread opinion that the pope also should be consulted in such matters. The essay examines twelve cases of canonization dealt with in Alexander's pontificate, among them those of Thomas Becket and Bernard of Clairvaux. The author concludes that the procedure of canonization became clearly established, and that Pope Alexander was quite certain of his right to control the veneration of any new saints. He agrees with Professor Kuttner that Alexander did not make a formal enactment reserving canonization to the Pope. Enactment followed practice.

The whole January issue of *Razón y Fe* is devoted to articles on the Council of Trent in commemoration of its fourth centenary. There are two bibliographical articles, one on Spanish works concerning the Council and the other on non-Spanish works.

The new Latin translation of the Psalter issuing from the Vatican Press will not be without interest for mediaeval historians, who must frequently concern themselves with the Latin versions of the Bible. The new version, made at the request of Pope Pius XII, is a triumph of textual criticism at its best. Edward P. Arbez, S.S., veteran expert in Old Testament studies, writes in enthusiastic appreciation of the new edition in the July number of the *American Ecclesiastical Review*. The new Psalter is authorized for the recitation of the Divine Office. Benziger Brothers have just issued a reproduction of the Vatican edition.

Marygrove College publishes its series of studies for 1945 under the title *Royal Charter*. The volume, devoted to Christian education, extends from Christ's charter to His Church to teach all nations to the encyclical *Rappresentanti in terra* of Pope Pius XI. The nineteen studies are grouped in three parts: patristic education, revivals of learning, and post-Trent education. The project was an excellent one for college students and the results are really worthwhile.

The Association congratulates the Very Reverend Valentine T. Schaaf, O.F.M., upon his elevation to the office of minister general of the Order of Friars Minor. Dr. Schaaf was for years a member of the faculty of the School of Canon Law at the Catholic University of America. His solid scholarship has long been an inspiration to those that knew him.

Ernst Posner has been appointed dean of the graduate division of the school of social science and public affairs at American University, Washington, D. C. Dr. Posner is a specialist in archival administration. He directed the ten-day course offered in that subject at the National Archives and Annapolis this summer.

Hugh J. Nolan has been appointed editor of the *Records* of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia. Father Nolan took his master's degree at Villanova College and has completed work for the doctorate at the Catholic University of America except for the publication of his dissertation. His dissertation is a life of the third bishop of Philadelphia, Francis Patrick Kenrick, from the bishop's earliest years up to his appointment in 1851 as sixth archbishop of Baltimore.

In the May number of the *English Historical Review* V. H. Galbraith pays tribute to Professor James Tait, who died on July 4, 1944, at the age of eighty-two. From 1902 to 1919 Tait was professor of ancient and mediaeval history at the University of Manchester. In 1919 he retired to devote himself to research. His best work was done on mediaeval institutions, but he wrote on biography and local history as well. His book reviews became renowned.

Max Farrand died on June 17 at the age of seventy-six. Since 1914 he had been research associate of Huntington Library. He was for seventeen years professor of American history at Yale University. In 1940 he was president of the American Historical Association.

The Reverend Thomas F. Cullen died on July 26 at the novitiate of the Franciscan Missionaries of Mary, Providence, Rhode Island, where he

had been chaplain for two decades. An alumnus of Georgetown University and of Saint Bernard's Seminary, Rochester, Father Cullen was the author of *The Spirit of Serra* and *The History of the Catholic Church in Rhode Island.*

The Reverend Raymond J. Gray, S.J., mediaevalist, head of the department of history and political science at Xavier University, Cincinnati, died on July 20 at the age of forty-eight. A native of Cleveland, he entered the Society of Jesus at Florissant, Missouri, in 1916. He pursued studies on the Island of Jersey for a period of three years. After securing the Diploma in French History and Literature from the University of Paris, he completed work for his Master of Arts degree at St. Louis University in 1924. He was ordained to the priesthood in 1929 and received his doctorate from Yale University in 1934. His doctoral dissertation, entitled: The Mediaeval Coronation Oath, a Study in Origins, has not been printed, though he had made arrangements for its publication just before his death. Father Gray taught at Xavier University since 1934. He contributed to several periodicals and was an active member of various historical societies. His death will be mourned by a very wide circle of friends and co-workers.

Monsignor John Augustine Ryan died on September 16 at the age of seventy-six. He was the most distinguished alumnus and professor of the Catholic University of America. Since the time of his doctoral dissertation on the *Living Wage,* published in 1906, he wielded his pen for the cause of social justice. Outstanding among his books is his *Distributive Justice* (1916). After years of teaching at St. Paul Seminary he assumed the chair of moral theology in the Catholic University of America in 1915. There, with sober enthusiasm, in his courses and seminar on fundamental moral and justice and rights he taught his students to think constructively on the problems of social justice. He retired from active teaching in the University at the age of seventy, but he continued his work as director of the department of social action of the National Catholic Welfare Conference. Inspired himself by the social teachings of Pope Leo XIII, John A. Ryan had the satisfaction of having his plan of social reconstruction adopted by the bishops of America at the end of the First World War and eventually of seeing it become for the most part law of the land. In the encyclical, *Quadragesimo anno,* of Pope Pius XI he recognized a renewed seal of approval of the highest ecclesiastical authority upon the principles for which he fought. Monsignor Ryan had a genuine interest in history and often appealed to its arguments. We are proud to say that he was a member of our Association and a regular reader of the REVIEW.

The Sisters, Servants of the Immaculate Heart of Mary of Monroe,

Michigan, celebrated the centennial of the founding of the congregation on July 26. Similar celebrations have been held by the communities at West Chester and Scranton, Pennsylvania.

The Congregation of the Sisters of the Poor of St. Francis, founded at Aachen, is observing its centenary this year. The sisters came to the United States in 1858. The congregation numbers 3,000 members in Europe and America.

The American centennial of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul will be observed in St. Louis September 28-October 1. Twelve years after its foundation by Frederic Ozanam in France, Bryan Mullanphy and Father Ambrose J. Heim introduced the society into the United States at St. Louis. There are now over 2,500 foundations of the society in this country.

The sesquicentennial of Mad Anthony Wayne's treaty with Little Turtle was adequately celebrated at Greenville, Ohio, on August 3. There were special church services, a pageant, an exhibit of the original Greenville Treaty, unveiling of a painting by Howard Chandler Christy depicting the signing of the treaty, and addresses by state notables.

The entire October issue of *The American Ecclesiastical Review* will be devoted to articles on Cardinal Newman in commemoration of the centennial of his conversion on October 9, 1845.

The sesquicentennial of Maynooth College is commemorated in several articles of the September issue of the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record.*

The Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul will observe the centenary of their coming to Milwaukee in 1946. An account of their history in Milwaukee is being prepared by Peter Leo Johnson.

Documents: Documents concerning the Real y Pontificia Universidad de San Carlos (*Boletín del Archivo General del Gobierno,* December, 1944).—The Relation by Philipp Segesser, translated with an introduction by Theodore E. Treutlein. (*Mid-America,* July).—The Colegio de San Juan de Letrán in 1552. France V. Scholes, Ed. (*Americas,* July).—Unpublished Letter of the First Lord Baltimore. Matthew Page Andrews (*Maryland Historical Magazine,* June).—Letters from the Milwaukee Diocese to the Ludwigmissionsverein. Ed. by Peter Leo Johnson (*Salesianum,* July).

BRIEF NOTICES

BERNSTEIN, HARRY. *Origins of Inter-American Interest, 1700-1812.* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. Pp. ix, 125. $2.00.) The explanation of the title in the preface of the volume under review produces mixed impressions. One is led to expect clarity of thought and thorough organization by the concise presentation of adequate reasons for the dates 1700-1812, and the restriction of North American interest to the areas of New York, New England, and Pennsylvania. On the other hand, the title reads "Inter-American." Furthermore, a difficulty arises in accounting for the statement: "While Spanish America, at the time of her independence was unable to adopt the democracy of the United States, there were real efforts to follow this country's liberal republicanism. There were no *religious* barriers to the *interchange* of views: the progress of inter-American relations was on a secular plane. Both continents shared the dynamic optimism of the Enlightenment, emphasizing the great future of New World man, once he was freed from European colonialism, despotism, and religious authoritariansim." First: it is difficult to determine the period to which the author refers; secondly, the Enlightenment was more than an economic or political policy—it was a philosophy based on rationalism that aimed at supplanting "religious authoritarianism."

A careful examination of the text bears out these misgivings. An impersonal style may be the historian's attempt at objectivity but to present acts of aggression without comment or censure is not very satisfying. Despite frequent reference to primary sources in copious footnotes, an examination of the bibliography reveals the emphasis placed on Spain's rivals or Spanish officialdom. Likewise, in the analysis of trading activities the reactions of Spanish agents are cited, who for the most part are "Peninsulares" not "Creoles." The latter are of importance in a development of inter-American interest. Cultural and political interest of North American leaders are kept on the "secular plane" by focusing them on "useful knowledge," i. e., commerce and agriculture.

However, the author is honest, though somewhat contradictory. He does not hesitate to note the "Hispanophobe bias" of the sources upon which the concepts of the general public were based, and to admit the religious motivations of early eighteenth-century New Englanders. Nor does he exclude the middle decade. What he fails to do is to point out that for the Spanish American at least there were religious barriers to mutual understanding. The Chilean priest who, as the author reports, considered the United States to be the source of a missionary activity based upon a republican gospel, may have sensed the hidden motives of many of his contemporaries (p. 82).

The volume of Mr. Bernstein was prepared and published under the direction of the American Historical Association from the income of the Albert J. Beveridge Memorial Fund. (ALPHONSE F. KUHN)

CASSIERE, ERNST. *Rousseau Kant Goethe.* Translated from the German by James Gutmann, Paul Oscar Kristeller, and John Herman Randall, Jr. (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1945. Pp. vii, 98. $1.50.) The little book entitled, *Rousseau Kant Goethe,* from the standpoint of scholarship and critical

acumen, is just what we should expect from the pen of its distinguished author, Ernst Cassiere. He approaches his subject equipped with an unusual understanding of the genuine teaching of the three men whom he has chosen as subjects of his study. In support of this statement we need adduce no more than the first part of the first section and the second section of the little work wherein Cassiere succeeds, on the one hand, in showing that in spite of the great contrast between Kant and Rousseau in personality, manner of life, and form of thought, the latter, nevertheless, was able to exercise a profound influence upon the former, and on the other hand, in solving the riddle of Kant's influence upon Goethe by way of the *Critique of Judgment*. Again, in the part entitled, "Rousseau and the Doctrine of Human Nature," the author singles out with gratifying simplicity precisely what appealed to Kant in Rousseau's work—"What Kant prized in Rousseau was the fact that he had distinguished more clearly than others between the mask that man wears and his actual visage. According to Cassiere, Rousseau was always, for Kant," . . . "the thinker who, in the realm of ethics, awakened him from dogmatic slumber—who had confronted him with new questions and stimulated him to new solutions." The difference and likeness, in the theory of law and state, between Rousseau and Kant is presented in a masterful chapter. How the Kantian ethics echoes Rousseau's teaching in these matters, while still representing a change in methodological foundation, is admirably explained. Further excellent illustrations of Cassiere's ability to uncover in a simple, convincing manner the likenesses as well as the contrasts existing between the teachings of the men he writes about await the reader. We are sure he will be satisfied. (JOHN V. FLYNN)

COCHRANE, CHARLES NORRIS, University College, Toronto. *Christianity and Classical Culture. A Study of Thought and Action from Augustus to Augustine*. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1944. Pp. vii, 523. $5.00.) "The theme of this work is the revolution in thought and action which came about through the impact of Christianity upon the Graeco-Roman world," a theme, which as the author says, "has not received the attention it deserves, especially perhaps from English-speaking scholars." The book is divided into three parts: I. Reconstruction; II. Renovation; III. Regeneration. Part I deals with the ethical, social, and political ideas and ideals which motivated the establishment of the *pax Augusta*. Part II covers the period from Constantine to the death of Theodosius and is primarily devoted to an analysis of the efforts of the first Christian emperors to employ Christianity as a "principle of political cohesion." Part III is concerned with the religious and intellectual ideas and ideals which Christianity offered as a substitute for the traditional pagan religion and philosophy.

This book is a very thoughtful and penetrating study by a competent scholar. While modern literature treating of the subject is seldom quoted, one does not have to read far before he is convinced that the author is as thoroughly familiar with the modern works which are pertinent as with the ancient sources. His treatment of St. Augustine's contribution to Christian thought in one of the greatest crises in human history is exceptionally well done and deserves the most careful reading.

One could wish, perhaps, that the author had emphasized more than he does

the relatively narrow limits within which the Christian emperors applied Christianity as a "principle of political cohesion." Apart from their recognition and support of Christianity as the sole religion of the state and their consequent suppression of paganism, the Christian emperors, as well as the great majority of Christians, were largely content to accept the traditional political, social, and economic structure of the pagan state. The really surprising feature in the legislation of Justinian, e.g., is not that it shows unmistakable Christian influence in the case of marriage and the family, but that Christian influences are so limited in number and importance.

The book is written in a very pleasing style and is furnished with a good index. (MARTIN R. P. MCGUIRE)

DOYLE, CHARLES HUGO. *The Life of Pope Pius XII.* (New York: Didier Publishing Co., 1945. Pp. x, 247. $3.00.) It is difficult to take the measure of a man while he is yet alive. Good biography takes time and a working familiarity with sources. The task is even more difficult when one relates the story of an individual whose influence is being felt in every sphere of life. The reviewer does not think Father Doyle intended to present a critical biography, however. From a few primary sources and some secondary material he has prepared a life of Pope Pius XII that makes interesting reading. The early life of Eugenio Pacelli is sketchy and the intimate dialogue without any reference to a source might indicate a play upon the author's imagination. However, it does add a personal touch that gives life and interest to the story. Quite naturally the major portion of the book treats of Eugenio Pacelli as a public servant of the Church. The author traces his diplomatic career from the time of his appointment to the Congregation of Extraordinary Affairs in 1901 until his election to the Papacy in 1939. Father Doyle explains each custom and institution of the Church as he meets them in his story. To some these digressions will be padding, but to others, less well-informed, they will be sources of interesting information. The author's portrait of the man can be summed up in this fashion, "The secret of his success lies within him: in his knowledge, his strong spirit, his faith and his courage." The lay reader will rejoice because the footnotes are placed in the back of the book, but this same point, together with an insufficient use of sources, will disappoint the critical historian. The book will satisfy all in this respect, that it has a good index for quick reference. The story is well told, but its chief appeal will be to the lay reader. (JAMES P. GRAHAM)

GOODRICH, LELAND M., and MARIE J. CARROLL (Eds.). *Documents on American Foreign Relations.* Volume VI, *July 1943-June 1944.* (Boston: World Peace Foundation, 1945. Pp. xxx, 725. $3.75.) The sixth volume of *Documents on American Foreign Relations,* maintaining as it does the high standard of scholarship in selection and organization of source material noted in reviews of earlier volumes, suggests the application of the term "monumental" to the series. The editors continue to point out that their aim is to contribute "to a better popular understanding of American foreign relations" and that the material in the current volume is necessarily incomplete, but the opinion may be ventured that serious students of diplomatic history and international relations will come to consider this series as the most useful of all compilations in their fields.

The year covered by this volume marked the definite turning of the tide of the war, the clearest evidence of which was the collapse of Italy as an Axis partner. The events connected with the Italian surrender and relations with the Badoglio government are adequately treated in Chapter IV. The headnote is an excellent summary (pp. 160-162).

This and other victories brought the end of the war nearer and with it an increased emphasis on the solution of post-war problems, and the change is reflected in the organization of the volume. New chapter headings dealing with the general aspects of such subjects as International Peace and Security, Trade and Finance, Transportation and Communications, Agriculture and the Use of Natural Resources, Labor and Social Questions, and Cultural Relations have been added, following the material on the United Nations. Relations with single nations are considered in the last three chapters.

The index, all-important in a work of this type, is well-planned, as is the expanded table of contents. It is unfortunate that the editors must rely on official translations of foreign documents. For example, the letter from the Argentine foreign minister to Secretary Hull is quite unintelligible in part (pp. 525-528). (ALLAN J. DOHERTY)

HEBERLE, RUDOLF. *From Democracy to Nazism.* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1945. Pp. vi, 130. $2.50.) Dr. Heberle's book is one of the least pretentious but one of the most useful studies of the background of Nazi Germany. Where many others indulge in generalities, Heberle bases his conclusions upon a painstaking investigation of concrete facts. The methods employed are those of André Siegfried's *Tableau politique de la France de l'Ouest sous la Troisième République.* Party allegiance is placed in relation to geography and to the economic conditions determined by geography, and the results are, at times, rather startling. Siegfried considered a larger area than Heberle, and he could apply his observations to a longer period of time; also, he did not have to concern himself with a change as abrupt as the rise of the Nazis to major strength in the early 1930's. The province of Schleswig-Holstein, which Heberle analyzes, shows, however, certain tendencies which are characteristic of all of Germany and, therefore, his study leads to results of a general validity.

Among Heberle's conclusions the following may be emphasized. First, going back to the grass roots of the Nazi movement, one finds no traces of the philosophical antecedents usually ascribed to Nazis, but only such concrete grievances as falling prices, leading to a rising burden of indebtedness and mass resistance to foreclosures. Second, no typically "fascist" views were the driving force which brought large masses of voters to the Nazi party; so far as political ideas enter the picture at all they are often the direct opposite of what Nazism stands for, the Nazi leaders being most careful in concealing their ultimate aims. Third, medium and small-scale farmers in comparatively poor districts were the ideal recruiting ground for the Nazis; Hitler's followers did not pile up strong majorities except in typically rural districts—a fact which should give the advocates of the Morgenthau plan something to think about. Fourth, the federal structure of Germany actually aided the Nazis, their rise to a share in power in Thuringen, Braunschweig, and Oldenburg

preparing for them the road to further successes. Fifth, a large percentage of the gains made by the Nazis after their rise to power need not be taken too seriously since "in many cases these conversions were nothing but a rationalization of conduct . . . motivated by ambition or fear."

In these lessons there is little to encourage those who like to revel in their horror of "German depravity," but much to provide a reliable guide to those who are willing to admit that human beings are the same wherever we go and that the answer to concrete defects is a concrete and workable alternative. (FERDINAND A. HERMENS)

HUDSON, MANLEY O. *International Tribunals, Past and Future.* (Washington: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and Brookings Institution. 1944. Pp. xii, 287. $2.50.) Judge Hudson, American member of the Permanent Court of International Justice, has generously brought his experience and learning to the task of analyzing the problems involved in setting up or continuing and expanding machinery for the adjudication of international disputes. The opening chapter presents a brief history of international tribunals during the period extending from the Jay Treaty of 1794 to the most recent agreements. The second part of the book is given over to the problems of structure, manning, administration, jurisdiction, and procedure. Despite the peculiar inadequacies and difficulties of international law—difficulties relating to jurisdiction, election of judges, financing—one is impressed by the immense effectiveness of the various international tribunals that have come into existence during the past century and a half. Judge Hudson's argument in behalf of the continued use and adaptation of the existing juridical structure is entirely convincing; the "general agreement which has come to obtain upon the essentials of the judicial process" will in that way best be preserved and employed.

The eighth chapter on the sources and evidence of international law, reveals the common dislike of contemporary publicists and writers in the field for this question; it is a dislike which is allied to a common inability. The student of the nature and sources of international law would be interested in knowing the implication of the three-fold movement which Judge Hudson describes and is happy about the movement of international law away from "the philosophies of the seventeenth-century jurist-theologians who were its founders," the movement "outside the orbit of the naturalistic thinking of the eighteenth-century jurists," and finally the movement away from "many of the limitations which in the nineteenth century led some positivist writers to deny its character as law." One wonders just where international law *is* moving; and one suspects that Judge Hudson would like to insist upon the natural moral basis of international law but that, unfortunately, there is still something unacceptable about such language. (CHARLES N. R. MCCOY)

KESTEN, HERMAN. *Copernicus and His World.* Translated from the German by E. B. Ashton and Norbert Guterman. (New York: Roy Publishers. 1945. Pp. ix, 408. $3.50.) A book of this kind is difficult to review. On the one hand the work is presented to the reader as history. The publisher's blurb on the jacket says of the author: "Far from romancing or neglecting facts, Mr.

Kesten has founded this important biography on enormous research, on the most exact facts of history and science. With the merits of a painstaking historical work he has combined an exciting and enthralling narrative." On the other hand, it is obvious to any reader who is at all conversant with the facts that this work is neither biography nor history. In many respects, it is a satire on Copernicus and his world in the tradition of the Renaissance lampoon.

With a somewhat childish play on the word "revolution" in the title *De Revolutionibus Orbium Caelestium* given to the great work of Copernicus, Kesten would make of the proposal and acceptance of the Copernican system a successful revolt against all religion, and against all restraint based on the dominion of a personal God.

"We meet," he says "the whole curious blend of all great men of incongruous traits that are characteristic [*sic*] in this canon who dedicates his church-wrecking thesis to the Pope. . . . Did Copernicus fail to see that he was pushing the dear Lord out into the infinite void? Giordano Bruno saw it and was burned for it" (p. 5). Again, "Nicolaus Copernicus who rose against twenty centuries of pious nonsense as the Christian Church's most dangerous because most hidden apostate—this 'prodigal son' was, of course, more than any other the proper heir of his time" (p. 8). ". . . Copernicus who was about to overthrow the whole dogmatic structure of the Church" (p. 106). "Was Copernicus an atheist? . . . This son of the Church always had God on his lips, the term slid off his pen with the greatest of ease. But no one before him had driven God so far away from man. Copernicus, that most tranquil of revolutionaries, shook the world in the quietest and most concealed way. . . . Luther thought he could call him a fool with impunity. And Melancthon simply called for the police when he heard of his work; any king seemed to him powerful enough to make such a restless head roll. There were other revolutionaries who spoke of God in the language of saints or children while they set fire to the fuse with which they blew God up in the air" (p. 225). ". . . Such was the bold man who stole the heavens from the Lord! . . . According to Kant God was a delusion. And according to Copernicus? . . ." (p. 226). "Under many names, in many fields and on many levels, this immense struggle between the world-revolution and world-obscurantism continues" (p. 408).

The author puts forth all this amazing nonsense without a shred of real historical evidence in its favor and in the face of the obvious testimony of the life and writings of the real Copernicus. Kesten's book could have been just as interesting had he not allowed his anti-religious animus to betray his historical sense. Intermixed with genuine historical detail are juicy bits of back-fence gossip uncritically retailed from Renaissance literary sources. And throughout the work there runs an almost continuous chain of innuendoes, exaggerations, and unwarranted generalizations.

There is no excuse for such statements as these. "Once, we are informed, the senior Kopernik went on a trip to Breslau. And once he became a Tertiary Brother of the Polish Dominicans—i. e., in exchange for absolution of his own sins, he was supposed to denounce those of his neighbors to the spies of the Inquisition" (p. 15). . . . "We know the picture of medieval towns. The largest

houses were owned by the dear Lord" (p. 17). Again, "The following were favorite questions of the Scholastics:

'Can God undo something that has happened—make of a prostitute, a pure maid, for instance?'

Or: 'Why did Adam in Paradise eat of an apple rather than a pear?'

Or: 'For how many angels is there room on a pinpoint?'

And, 'Was the first man equipped with a navel?' (p. 45).

"As though following the Jesuit maxim: *Si quid fecisti nega*—If you have done anything deny it—Copernicus . . ." (p. 246). Introducing the exceedingly slender hypothesis of some Jewish writers with a question: "Was not Columbus an Aragonese Jew without the slightest idea of navigation, a Jewish poet, unfamiliar with the world, who had the Cubans mixed up with the Japanese?" (p. 21), Kesten soon makes it an historical fact: "Michael Servetus, like Columbus a marano or forcibly baptized Jew from Aragon, . . ." (p. 24).

Kesten's style is vivid and his translators have done it justice. With all the material the book contains, it could have been a masterpiece of biographical literature. (JAMES B. MACELWANE)

KLIMAS, PETRAS. *Ghillebert de Lannoy in Medieval Lithuania: Voyages and Embassies of an Ancestor of One of America's Great Presidents.* An Introduction by Constantine R. Jurgela, LL.B., LL.M. (New York: Lithuanian American Information Center. 1945. Pp. 96. $1.00.) This is a translation of an article on De Lannoy's two voyages to Lithuania and the neighboring countries (1413-14 and 421), published in 1933 in the Lithuanian review, *Praeitis* by the distinguished Lithuanian diplomat and historian, Petras Klimas, whose biography, including his tragic fate during the present war, has been added by the translator (p. 17).

Mr. Jurgela has also written an introduction in two parts, concerning President Roosevelt's descent from Ghillebert's brother, and the general history of Lithuania. Moreover, in a note preceding the reprinted text of De Lannoy's description of Lithuania, he discusses an article on "Gilbert de Lannoy and his discovery of East Central Europe," recently published by the present reviewer in the *Bulletin of the Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences in America* (January, 1944).

The reviewer welcomes Mr. Jurgela's translation of a valuable study on the same subject which for linguistic reasons was not available to most of the interested scholars. And he is obliged to him for having noted "some additional bits of information" which he found in his own contribution. He must, however, stress two points. Speaking about the descent of the American Delanos from Gilbert's brother, the present writer was, of course, fully aware of the connection with President Roosevelt, but he did not mention it in an academic publication without propaganda purposes. On the other hand, he had not the slightest intention to minimize the role of Lithuania nor of her ruler, Vytautas (Vitold). That Lithuania was then federated with Poland, is a fact confirmed by several charters of Vytautas himself. It is difficult to understand why Lithuanian scholars deny this fact which greatly contributed to make Lithuania under Vytautas "more influential in international relations than ever before or afterwards," a statement of the reviewer's article which clearly shows,

together with many others, that he had no derogatory objectives. It would be much easier to point out the obvious "minimizing" of Poland in the article of Dr. Klimas, especially where he refers to French-Polish relations which are badly misrepresented (pp. 56-57), and also in some remarks of Mr. Jurgela.

De Lannoy's visits and diplomatic missions to both Poland and Lithuania are an excellent example to demonstrate the close historical connection of these two countries. (OSCAR HALECKI)

MAY, EARL CHAPIN. *Principio to Wheeling.* (New York: Harper & Bros. 1945. Pp. xiv, 324. $3.00.) The rise of the Wheeling Steel Corporation is considered by the writer to be a "pageant of Iron and Steel." He might better have substituted the word "saga" for "pageant" since he treats most of his heroes as if they were legendary characters. Outside of the fact that the beginnings of this adventure in steel involves a relative of George Washington (and the publisher makes much of the discovery), there is nothing in the book to recommend to the historian, save inconsequential detail and sugar-coated chronicling. A book of 324 pages which has been divided into forty-three chapters can hardly be expected to possess continuity. And although the author had access to local archives, these sources, if the volume at hand be their witness, must have contained little of historical value. At all events, detailed conversations that took place three hundred years ago are unsupported by reference.

The story of steel is wrongly considered by Mr. May to be the story and adventures of great men. He forgets the multitude of little men and humble folk who, under harsh taskmasters, brought forth steel from burning caldrons. If May was interested in history, he might have recorded a little more of the attempts of the iron and steel workers to extricate themselves from the tyranny of feudal steel barons, company towns, company unions, strikebreakers, twelve-hour days, seven-day weeks, injury, disease, and death. His treatment of the steel unions (and who can write of steel and ignore them?) betrays a lack of sympathy with their ambitions and aims. When he mentions unions at all, the writer speaks of their connection with strikes, making no attempt, however, to explain the factors underlying these methods of economic warfare. The Great Steel Strike of 1919, for example, is placed at the doorstep of the "doctrinaire William Z. Foster." But Mr. May forgets that ninety-eight percent of the steel workers at that time voted to strike. And furthermore, it was the staid and conservative American Federation of Labor which appointed Foster to head the strike committee. Who knows what part the attitude of the steel magnates played in making Foster "doctrinaire?" Two decades later, of course, collective bargaining is proceeding satisfactorily in the steel towns of West Virginia. The fact that the local union is among the strongest of those that belong to the United Steel Workers of America may have had something to do with it.

It must be said that Mr. May shows a curious understanding of the American worker. Speaking of the time when the accident rate in steel was very high and when a worker was likely to have his feet, if not his head, crushed by falling objects, the author makes this comment: "There is a limit beyond which American workmen will not welcome having things done for them freely. They are exceedingly chary about accepting charity. Hence it was necessary

to sell both the idea and the protective shoes to Wheeling steelworkers" (p. 247). Mr. May is again rather naive toward the end of his volume in discussing the effect of World War II on steel income. While he reminds his reader that the workers' pay increased seventy-four percent between 1939-1943, he further adds that the steel plants themselves "did not do so well with their investment" (p. 299). Perhaps this is the reason why the steel corporations now have on the law books a provision whereby after the present war they will be guaranteed large refunds of their excess profit taxes, if they lose money or even if they make no more than they did in peacetime.

A great deal has been written on Big Steel and Little Steel. The independent steel companies, such as Wheeling, have been neglected. It is unfortunate that their story is still to be written. (GEORGE A. KELLY)

POHL, FREDERICK J. *Amerigo Vespucci—Pilot Major.* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1944. Pp. x, 249. $3.00.) We have here a valiant and eloquent attempt to demonstrate that Amerigo Vespucci and not Christopher Columbus discovered the new world and that in consequence it was correctly and not erroneously named America. Because "in the case of Vespucci, by claiming less one can prove more" (p. ix), Mr. Pohl starts out by accepting as definitive Northrup's and Magnaghi's verdict that Vespucci's *Four Voyages* and *Mundus Novus* are forgeries; wherefore he bases his study of the navigator on none but the authentic writings of Vespucci: the three letters he wrote, namely in Seville (1500), at Cape Verde (1501), and in Lisbon (1502). Certain allegations and surmises in these letters, the author holds, are proof positive that Vespucci and his fellow navigators, to quote the former's own words, "arrived at a new land which, for many reasons that are enumerated in what follows, we observed to be a new continent" (p. 137); and because this new continent now blocked the hoped-for sea route to India by sailing west, Vespucci's next efforts, according to Mr. Pohl, were directed to finding a waterway through this continent to the sea on the other side of it (p. 145).

While carefully scrutinizing and weighing Mr. Pohl's line of reasoning, one is inclined to wonder if on decisive issues he does not read into the text of Vespucci's letters what the text does not contain but must be understood to contain if Vespucci is to be regarded as the discoverer of America, that is, as the one who first conceived the land to be "a new continent" and not merely as the one who first got sight of it. Thus even the accepted definition of "discovery" must be made to fit, not to speak of the passages in the letters which are not quite so patent and definitive as Mr. Pohl seems to think they are. The same, it appears, is true with regard to Vespucci's supposed idea of finding a strait connecting the known ocean, the Atlantic, with the unknown but conjectured one between the "new continent" and Asia.

Whatever opinion one may adopt concerning the validity of Mr. Pohl's arguments, no one can deny that, as stated in the beginning of this review, his study is a valiant and eloquent attempt to make Vespucci the discoverer of America. At the same time, the notes (pp. 207-233) to the twelve chapters and the bibliography (pp. 235-240) indicate that the author of the volume is familiar with the vast source materials dealing with the subject he discusses.

The Columbus problem is still with us—and perhaps always will be—and

those who are interested in it will do well to delve into this latest contribution toward solving an important phase of the problem. At the same time, however, one will have to guard against allowing the author's charming enthusiasm and rhetorical outbursts to stand in the way of careful evaluation and sober judgment. (FRANCIS BORGIA STECK)

RISTELHUEBER, RENÉ. *Mission Française.* (Montreal: Les Éditions Variétés, Dussault et Péladeau, 1943. Pp. 223. $1.25.) The author of this book has spent his entire life in the diplomatic service of France. Having retired from active service, he surveys the field of his activities in China, Syria, Palestine, Tunisia, Constantinople, Switzerland, Lithuania, Norway, Bulgaria, and Canada.

The *leitmotiv* for the author in writing his book was to show the influence of France in foreign countries, always directed by a close co-operation of national and religious ideas and plans. To him, the national ideal and the Catholic religion were the pillars of French diplomacy throughout the centuries, which is the role of France among the nations: *La Mission Française.* The book does not pretend to be a scientific treatise. Personal reminiscences are mixed with historical reports. It is more or less a caleidoscopic picture, illustrations picked at random from events of past and present. One would rather expect some explanation of events which happened during the time of his diplomatic service.

In the chapter on China a general reference is made to the protectorate of Catholic missions, and the author relishes in telling of the glorious official reception granted to the French embassy in the last days of the empire. Concerning Syria, reference is made to the protectorate of the missions with a short historical account of the French regime, followed by a biographical sketch of Mgr. Pierre Chébli, Maronite archbishop (1872-1917). The chapter on Bethlehem mentions mostly the quarrels at the holy places. In treating Tunisia, the author delights in explaining the French colonial administration, its policies towards Islam, and the accomplishments in material developments and educational progress. A short chapter is devoted to Charles Nicolle, director of the Pasteur Institute. The author deals with the return from German influence to French predominance after World War I and reports on the enthusiastic reception of the French commander, General Franchet d'Esperey, in his chapter on Turkey.

One of the best chapters in the book is the brief account on Switzerland, its people, government, material culture, and religious status. M. Ristelhueber writes in a sympathetic way about Lithuania, an unhappy country striving in vain for its independence. In contrast to Lithuania, Norway is spoken of as a country, prospering through its courageous seafarers and explorers and through the individualism of its people. In a supplement the work of the Dominicans is related. Bulgaria is described as a fief of French influence, under the French protectorate of missions and dominated by the education of French religious orders. Finally, the beginning of French colonization by Maisonneuve is covered in the chapter on Canada. In an appendix a short comparison is made of the French penetration into Canada (1534) and the Near East (1535) down to 1860 (MATHIAS BRAUN)

SALMON, EDWARD T., Professor of Ancient History in McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario. *A History of the Roman World from 30 B.C. to A.D. 138.* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1944. Pp. xiii, 363. $5.50.) The author explains in his preface that R. P. Longden, who was originally commissioned to write this volume, was killed in an air-raid during the battle of Britain. He did not have access to any material that may have been left by Mr. Longden and he himself wrote the book in haste and while he was for a time, at least, on military service. Furthermore, he lays no claim to originality for his work, which "merely seeks to provide a reasonably up-to-date synthesis of the history of the Early Empire." The preface, accordingly, pretty much disarms criticism. But since the book has actually been published, a few critical remarks are due in justice to the prospective reader.

Infelicities of style and poor arrangement of material are obviously the unfortunate results of haste. The chief fault, however, which the reviewer has to find with the work is that it is too narrowly political in range and emphasis to give the general reader a "synthesis of the history of the Early Empire." While the book contains a fairly clear and competent sketch of the political history of the early empire, with stress on military organization and campaigns, it is either weak or shows outright lacunae in social and economic history. The three short chapters devoted to literature and the one chapter devoted to art are superficial and incomplete. Education under the empire, e.g., nowhere receives systematic treatment. There is no chapter on social life as such and this deficiency is not made up under other headings. The chapter on the rise of Christianity is rather superficial and there is no formal treatment of paganism in the period from the death of Augustus to Hadrian. While one chapter is devoted to economic life, agriculture and agricultural workers are not handled adequately anywhere in the book.

Mr. Salmon is a competent scholar and could have written a satisfactory book under more favorable circumstances. Therefore, it is hard to see why he and his publishers let this volume be issued. As a one-volume history of the early empire, it will not bear favorable comparison with Bury's *Student's Roman Empire,* however antiquated that work may be in places, with Albertini's *L'Empire romain,* with the sections covering the same period in Cary's *History of Rome,* or perhaps even with Wells and Barrows' *Short History of the Roman Empire.*

The book contains five maps, four appendices, a select bibliography, and an index. (MARTIN R. P. MCGUIRE)

VLEKKE, BERNARD H. M. *The Story of the Dutch East Indies.* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1945. Pp. xvii, 233. $3.00.) This is a revised and popular version of the author's *Nusantara—A History of the East Indian Archipelago* (Cambridge, 1943). It gives a concise account of the Indonesian state and its civilization before the advent of the Dutch, the founding of the Dutch colony at Batavia, and the subsequent history including a brief outline of the rise of Indonesian nationalism and Japanese invasion of the islands. This book will be useful to the general public who should know more about these rich islands of Asia which are bound to play an important role in world economics and world politics.

The policy behind the founding of Batavia by the Dutch East India Company under the leadership of Jan Pieterszoon Coen, discloses one point of the highest importance, as it gives insight into basic factors of economics of Asia in the seventeenth century. The Company was to make its major profit from inter-Asian trade, not from the imports and exports from Europe and Asia. The relation between Europe and Asia was not that of home country and colony in those years. Coen pointed out that the profits from inter-Asian trade would exceed those of the European commerce in the same measure "as these countries of Asia exceed those of Europe in population, consumption of goods and industry" (pp. 85-86).

Dutch colonial policy is fundamentally no different from other colonial systems of European powers in Asia; it is based upon the principle of making profit by any means. Thus at one time the opium trade played an important part in the general policy of exploitation of the people and even their degradation (p. 122). The spirit of the Dutch government in the East Indies during the nineteenth century and the nature of the much-praised "culture system" has been described by the author in the following manner:

> Under this system (culture) the government demanded either payment of the land rent or cultivation of one-fifth of the rice field in a crop indicated by the Director of Cultures. (Sugar, coffee and indigo were the main products provided by Java during the period of Culture System.) . . . *The natural result was the introduction of compulsory labor and the exploitation of Java as though it were a huge plantation owned by the government.*
>
> The financial results of the Culture System were satisfactory for the Netherlands. Between 1831 and 1877 the treasury received 823,000,000 guilders from the Indies. Once the system began to yield results, the human tendency to profiteer as much as possible revealed itself in the Netherlands Ministry of Colonies, and for nearly twenty years government expenses in the Indies were pared to the bone, without regard for their educational or political needs, in order to raise the figure of remittance from Batavia to Europe . . . (pp. 155-156).

The Dutch government in the East Indies has done very little for the educational and industrial development of the country to benefit the people. "Although 40 per cent of the children between six and nine years of age went to school in 1940, more than 90 per cent of the population was still illiterate . . ." (p. 205). This is the result of the Dutch rule of nearly three hundred years, over a people who had their own civilization before the advent of the alien rulers.

In Dutch Indies, like the rest of Asia, the spirit of nationalism is growing fast. Its manifest goal is freedom of the people from foreign domination. This spirit has played a very important part during the World War II. The author makes it clear that the failure of the Japanese to win active support of the Javanese people is due to their national consciousness and growing national unity and determination for national freedom (p. 195). Thus it is certain that re-establishment of a colonial system of the Dutch which deprives the people of their inalienable rights will not be calmly accepted by the people of Indonesia. Today there is much talk of "trustee-ship" for the colonial peoples; and it will be of great interest to watch the developments in administration of the Dutch Indies. (TARAKNATH DAS)

WRIGHT, LOUIS B., and JULIA H. MACLEOD. *The First Americans in North Africa. William Eaton's Struggle for a Vigorous Policy against the Barbary Pirates, 1799-1805.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1945. Pp. vii, 227. $3.00.) With the history of North Africa, the Barbary pirates, and the Barbary wars as background the authors have depicted the stormy adventures of the spirited but imprudent, patriotic but critical William Eaton. From the Eaton papers in the Huntington Library is presented an interesting account of his career first as consul to Tunis—an office which tribute and deference to clay-footed corsairs made distasteful; and later as commander-in-chief of a self-organized expedition against bothersome Tripoli—a task which, although fore-doomed to disappointment, was more to the liking of the Yankee Federalist. Cosmopolitan rather than American, Eaton's desert army was ably supported by Lieutenant O'Bannon and his seven marines—a fact which is commemorated in the Marine Corps anthem. In the telling of the story light is shed upon the rather cool reception given the upstart American by the nations of Europe. Brought out, also, is the not surprising lack of efficiency in the consular affairs of the young republic—a situation which was not improved by the enmity between Federalists and Republicans. With regard to the conduct of Barbary affairs, a worthy effort is made to exonerate Thomas Jefferson, and censure is shifted to John Adams, the Federalists and a miserly Congress. Aaron Burr does not appear favorably, for, in passing, the authors definitely uphold Eaton's testimony at the conspirator's trial. Some of the material of this study Wright and Macleod have already previewed in recent periodical literature. Well done and scholarly, if the work suffers at all, it is from too great an emphasis on background and a style which is occasionally repetitious. (TIMOTHY J. CASEY)

PERIODICAL LITERATURE

MISCELLANEOUS

Los estudios históricos y su valor formativo. José de la Riva Agüero (*Revista de la Universidad Católica del Perú*, April).

Pierre Joseph Proudhon, Harbinger of Fascism. J. Salwyn Schapiro (*Amer. Histor. Rev.*, July).

The Democratic Spirit of the Roman Law and the Common Law. Robert Neuner (*Seminar*, III).

Peacemaking after Ideological Wars. Ross Hoffman (*Thought*, Sept.).

The Cultus of Our Lady and the Graeco-Roman World: An Alleged Instance of Religious Syncretism. Humphrey J. T. Johnson (*Clergy Review*, May).

St. Thomas Aquinas and Popular Sovereignty. Andrew Beck (*ibid.*, July).

Absolution in the Early Church: The View of St. Pacianus. Clarence McAuliffe, S.J. (*Theolog. Studies*, Mar.).

The Edict of Caesar Augustus. Eugene W. Seraphin, O.F.M. (*Cath. Biblical Quart.*, Jan.).

The Divine Ideas, in the Writings of St. Augustine. Lawrence F. Jansen (*Modern Schoolman*, Mar.).

Dedication of Sacred Places in the Early Sources and in the Letters of Gregory the Great. John A. Eidenschink (*Jurist*, July).

Pope Alexander III and the Canonization of Saints. E. W. Kemp (*Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, Fourth Series, Vol. XXVII, 1945).

Public Opinion in the Theory of Democracy. Francis G. Wilson (*Thought*, June).

Old Provençal Lyric Poetry: Latin and Arabic Influences. Guido Errante (*ibid.*).

Late Mediaeval Population Patterns. Josiah Cox Russell (*Speculum*, Apr.).

The Influence of Romances on Tournaments of the Middle Ages. Ruth Cline (*ibid.*).

Two Neglected Paladins of Charlemagne: Erich of Friuli and Gerold of Bavaria. James Bruce Ross (*ibid.*).

The Date and Authorship of the Poem "Adoro Te Deuote". F. J. E. Raby (*ibid.*).

Origins of Monastic History—III. Fr. John Morson, O.C.R. (*Pax*, Summer 1945).

The Pointed Arch in Franciscan Theology. Thomas Plassmann, O.F.M. (*Franciscan Studies*, June).

Christ's Rôle in the Universe according to St. Irenaeus, Part II. Dominic Unger, O.F.M. Cap. (*ibid.*).

Ockham's Theory of Truth. Philotheus Boehner, O.F.M. (*ibid.*).

Fray Manuel del Santisimo Sacramento, the Last Franciscan in Kiangsi, China. Bernward Willeke, O.F.M. (*ibid.*).

The First Capuchin Missionaries. Fr. Salvator Schlaefer (*Round Table of Franciscan Research*, May).

The Capuchin Nuns of St. Clare. Fr. Thaddeus MacVicar (*ibid.*).

Can Dante's Inferno Be Exactly Charted? Allan H. Gilbert (*Pmla*, June).

Designs by More and Erasmus for a New Social Order. Robert P. Adams (*Studies in Philology*, Apr.).

Recent Literature of the Renaissance: A Bibliography and Index. Hardin Craig [*et al.*] (*ibid.*).

Centenario de Trento 1545-1945. [Eleven articles by various authors]. (*Razón y Fe*, Jan.).

Los protestantes en Trento. F. Javier Montalban (*Razón y Fe*, Mar.).

S. Francisco de Sales. Ascânio Brandão (*Revista Eclesiástica Brasileira*, Mar.).

Gesuiti italiani nelle missioni spagnuole al tempo dell' espulsione (1767-1768). Guglielmo Kratz, S.I. (*Archivum Historicum Societatis Iesu*, 1942).

Le P. Barthélemy Kašíc (1575-1650). Données nouvelles et travaux récents. Miroslav Vanino, S.I. (*ibid.*).

San Francisco de Borja y el plan misional de San Pío V. Primeros pasos de una Congregación de Propaganda Fide. León Lopetegui, S.I. (*ibid.*).

Contributo di Gaetano Luigi Marini e di Giovanni Fantuzzi alla storia della soppressione dei Gesuiti. Giuseppe Castellani, S.I. (*ibid.*).

Un livret d'instructions de 1660 pour les archives des maisons de la Compagnie. Edmond Lamalle, S.I. (*ibid.*).

L'architetto Bartolomeo Ammannati e i Gesuiti. Pietro Pirri, S.I. (*ibid.*, 1943).

Die Anfänge des römischen Archivs der Gesellschaft Jesu (1538-1548). Georg Schurhammer, S.I. (*ibid.*).

La "Mascarilla" de S. Ignacio. Pedro Leturia, S.I. (*ibid.*).

Cincuentenario de Monumenta Historica, S.I. 1894-1944. Dionisio Fernández Zapico, S.I. (*ibid.*).

Sultan Yahya e il P. Acquaviva. Pietro Pirri, S.I. (*ibid.*).

Les catalogues des provinces et des domiciles de la Compagnie de Jésus. Note de bibliographie et de statistique. Edmond Lamalle, S.I. (*ibid.*).

Versuch einer Bibliographie des P. Bernhard Duhr, S.I. Josef Teschitel, S.I. (*ibid.*).

The Melkites. E. J. B. Fry (*Eastern Churches Quarterly*, July, 1944).

Byzantine Catholics in Italy. Donald Attwater (*ibid.*).

The Paulicians. Tiran Nersoyan (*ibid.*, Oct.).

The Study of Church History and Christian Reunion. F. Dvornik (*ibid.*, Jan.).

Three Documents on the History of Christianity in South Arabia (*Anglican Theolog. Rev.*)

Veit Ludwig von Seckendorf and the Historical Lutheranism. L. W. Spitz (*Journal of Religion*, Jan.).

EUROPEAN

Crónica aragonesa del tiempo de Juan II. Martin de Riquer (*Analecta Sacra Tarraconensia*, Jan., 1944).

Manuscritos patrísticos existentes en la Biblioteca de la Universidad de Barcelona. Francisco Miquel Rosell (*ibid.*).

El beato Ramón Lull y la cuestión de la renunciabilidad de la Sede Romana. Sebastián Garcías Palou (*ibid.*).

Los Correos de la curia regia en la Corona de Aragón a principios del siglo XIV. J. Ernesto Martínez Ferrando (*ibid.*).

Escuelas de lenguas orientales en los siglos XIII y XIV. José M.ª Coll, O.P. (*ibid.*).

Los funerales de Pedro el Ceremonioso en Gerona. Luis Batlle y Prats (*ibid.*).

El Concilio Tarraconense de 1533. José M.ª Madurell Marimón (*ibid.*).

La colección pictórica Batllori de Orovio. M. B. (*ibid.*).

Miscelánea: 1. Veracidad histórica de Prudencio; 2. Un obispo español desconocido del siglo V; 3. Otra inscripción cristiana de Mértola; 4. Fray Gonzalo de Ocaña traductor del "Flos Sanctorum" anónimo, y; 5. Una traducción castellana del "Vita Christi" de Eximenis. José Vives y José Calveras, S.I. (*ibid.*).

La nueva redacción del "Libellus de Fide" de Baquiario, utilizada en la "Confessio fidei" del Ps.-Alcuino. José Madoz, S.J. (*Estudios eclesiásticos*, Apr., 1943).

Autenticidad de las cartas de San Braulio de Zaragoza. *Idem* (ibid., Oct.).

Sobre Fernando el Católico. II. Ricardo del Arco (*Universidad*, June).

Idea y estructura de una nueva Historia de la Civilización Española. Rafael Altamira y Crevea (*Filosofía y Letras*, July).

La Topografia del Gesù di Roma e le vertenze tra Muzio Muti e S. Ignazio secondo nuovi documenti. Pietro Pirri, S.I. (*Archivum Historicum Societatis Iesu*, 1941).

Der apostolische Vikar Nikolaus Steno und die Jesuiten. Johannes Metzler, S.I. (*ibid.*).

Les Missions intérieures des Jésuites Belges de 1833 à 1853. Édouard de Moreau, S.I. (*ibid.*).

Los Estudios de S. Ignacio en Barcelona (1524-1526). Cándido de Dalmases, S.I. (*ibid.*).

Pfarrseelsorge und Armut der Professhäuser. Ein Motu Proprio Pauls III aus der Vorgeschichte des römischen Gesù (1549). Joseph Wicki, S.I. (*Archivum Historicum Societatis Iesu*, 1942).

L'aurore de l'humanisme en France et le renouveau platonicien. Thomas Greenwood (*Revue de l'Université d'Ottawa*, July).

Will the Napoleonic Concordat Survive? W. J. Hegarty, C.C. (*Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, Jan.).

The Underground Press of France, Belgium, Norway, Denmark and the Netherlands. Staff of the OWI (*Library of Congress Quarterly Journal*, June).

The Destruction of the Benedictine Convent at Lisieux. (*Pax*, Summer 1945).

Has Fascism Ended with Mussolini? Don Luigi Sturzo (*Rev. of Politics*, July).

Hitler—the Simplifier of German Nationalism. Waldemar Gurian (*ibid.*).

Germany, Europe and the World. Ferdinand A. Hermens (*ibid.*).

France in Algeria. Werner Cahnman (*ibid.*).

Bismarck and the Three Emperors' Alliance, 1881-87. W. N. Medlicott (*Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, Fourth Series, Vol. XXVII, 1945).

Catholic Resistance in Nazi Germany. Friedrich Baerwald (*Thought*, June).

The Re-education of Germany. Alfons A. Nehrin (*ibid.*, Sept.).

Russian Nationalism under the Soviets. N. S. Timasheff (*ibid.*).

The Soviet Union. Waldemar Gurian (*Commonweal*, June 29).

German Catholicism. David Kernit (*Month*, May).

A Fifth Austria. John Murray (*ibid.*).

Is Austria "Lebensfähig"? Alfred Werner (*Journal of Central European Affairs*, July).

The Struggle for the Domination of the Baltic. Alfred Bilmanis (*ibid.*).

Poland and Russia in the Past and in the Future. Manfred Kridl (*ibid.*).

Foreign Policy and High Finance in the Bismarckian Period. Veit Valentin (*ibid.*).

The Pre-War Unionization of Polish Workers. Wladyslaw R. Malinowski (*ibid.*).

Stanislaw Leszczynski, King of Poland—Reformer in Exile. Eleanor L'H. Schlimgen (*Bulletin of the Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences in America*, Apr.).

The Ukrainians, Their Rite, History and Religious Destiny. James F. Coughlin (*Report 1943-44*, Canadian Cath. Hist. Assoc.).

The San Francisco Conference and Ukraine. Editorial (*Ukrainian Quarterly*, June).

Panslavism, Its Use and Abuse. Clarence A. Manning (*ibid.*).

Silver Jubilee of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, 1918-1943. Nicholas D. Czubatyi (*ibid.*).

BRITISH EMPIRE

New Light on St. Cuthbert? C. A. Bolton (*Clergy Review*, June).

The Scandinavian Colonies in England and Normandy. F. M. Stenton (*Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, Fourth Series, Vol. XXVII, 1945).

The Organization of Indentured Retinues in Fourteenth-Century England. N. B. Lewis (*ibid.*).

Petitions for Benefices from English Universities during the Great Schism. E. F. Jacob (*ibid.*).

Bracton on Kingship. Fritz Schulz (*Eng. Hist. Review*, May).

The Confirmation of the Charters, 1297. Part II. H. Rothwell (*ibid.*).

The Stuarts and their Style. S. T. Bindoff (*ibid.*).

Domesday Plough-teams: the South-Western Evidence. Reginald Lennard (*ibid.*).

A Wage-scale for Seamen, 1546. F. W. Brooks (*ibid.*).

Chaucer's Doctrine of Kings and Tyrants. Margaret Schlauch (*Speculum*, Apr.).

Irish in the Old English Charms. Howard Meroney (*ibid.*).

Morgain La Fee and the Celtic Goddesses. Roger S. Loomis (*ibid.*).

Hooker's Theory of Church and State. John S. Marshall (*Anglican Theolog. Rev.*, July).

The Religion of the Spirit in Seventeenth-Century England. Wilhelm Schenk (*Church Quart. Rev.*).

Conditional Loyalty in the Church of England. Bernard Leeming (*Month*, May).

The Background of Newman's "Idea of a University." Fergal McGrath (*Month*, July).

Newman and the Sword of the Spirit. Christopher Dawson (*Sword of the Spirit*, August).

Irish Protestants in Historical Perspective. Liam Brophy (*Lamp*, Sept.).

The Scottish Counter-Reformation before 1560. W. Stanford Reid (*Church History*, June).

Bicentenary of Fontenoy. P. Canon Power (*Studies*, June).

Maynooth College: 1795-1945. Neil Kevin (*Dublin Rev.*, July).

AMERICAN

Maryland and Tolerance. Harry S. Truman (*The Maryland Historical Magazine*, June).

Natural Religion and Religious Liberty in America. William W. Sweet (*Journal of Religion*, Jan.).

Ulster Scots in Colonial America. T. W. Moody (*Studies*, June).

Catholic Burial Grounds in Philadelphia. Joseph Jackson (*Records of the Amer. Hist. Society of Philadelphia*, June).

Italians in New York in the First Half of the Nineteenth Century. Howard A. Marraro (*New York History*, July).

The Pattern of Migration and Settlement on the Southern Frontier. Frank L. Owsley (*Journal of Southern History*, May).

The Writing of History in Ohio, 1935-1945. Francis P. Weisenburger (*Ohio State Archaeological and Hist. Quarterly*, July).

Beginnings of Catholicity in the City of Columbus, Ohio (1833-1849). John M. Lenhart, O.F.M. Cap. (*Social Justice Review*, July).

John Martin Henni. Benjamin J. Blied (*American-German Review*, June).

Cultural Interlude at Snake Diggings, Wisconsin. Peter Leo Johnson (*Salesianum*, July).

The Missouri Reader: Explorers in the Valley, Part I (Marquette and Jolliet, La Salle, Membré, Joutel, St. Cosme, Le Sueur, Panicaut, Gravier, Desliettes, Explorations of the Missouri River according to Margry). Ed. by Kate L. Gregg (*Missouri Hist. Rev.*, Apr.).

The Freedom of the Church College in Oklahoma. Charles Evans (*Chronicles of Oklahoma*, Summer).

Frances Xavier Cabrini, Foundress of Queen of Heaven Institute. Sister M. Lilliana Owens (*Colorado Magazine*, July).

The Second Founder of the Polish Seminary. A. Maksimik (*Polish-American Studies*, Jan.).

Polish Travelers in Nineteenth-Century United States. J. Swastek (*ibid.*).

Polish Travelers and Observers in the U. S. A. (1918-1939). C. Symonolewicz (*ibid.*).

Some Recent Publications relating to Polish-American History. A. S. Wolanin (*ibid.*).

The Polish Immigrant in Detroit to 1914. Sister M. Remigia, O.S.F. (*ibid.*).

The Polish Press in Wisconsin. S. Bonikowski, O.M.C. (*ibid.*).

A Half-Century on American Soil. Sister M. Zygmunta, Bernardine Sisters (*ibid.*).

Sienkiewicz and the Poles in America. Sister M. Nobilis, S.S.N.D. (*ibid.*).

Antoine Laumet, Alias Cadillac, Commandant at Michilimackinac: 1694-1697. Jean Delanglez (*Mid-America*, July).

A Critical Period in St. Patrick's Parish, Montreal—1866-74. Gerald Berry (*Report 1943-44*, Canadian Cath. Hist. Assoc.).

The Establishment of St. Patrick's Church in Sherbrooke, Quebec: Its Development and Influence throughout a Period of Fifty-Seven Years. Mrs. L. E. Codère (*ibid.*).

The Irish in Quebec. Brother Memorian Sheehy. F.S.C. (*ibid.*).

The Reverend Richard Jackson, Missionary to the Sulpicians. James R. Danaher (*ibid.*).

The Most Rev. Thomas L. Connolly, Archbishop of Halifax. F. J. Wilson (*ibid.*).

The Early History of St. Michael's Parish, Baddeck, Nova Scotia. Alexander D. MacLean (*ibid.*).

Mgr. Joseph-Antoine Irénée Douville et le Séminaire de Nicolet. Arthur Girard (*Rapport 1943-44*, La Société Canadienne d'Histoire de l'Eglise Catholique).

L'abbé Joseph Elzéar Bellemare. Raymond Douville (*ibid.*).

Cartier visite la rivière Nicolet en 1535. Gustave Lancto (*ibid.*).

L'avenir spirituel du peuple canadien-français. Léon-Mercier Gouin (*ibid.*).

Notes sur M. l'abbé Thomas Marie Olivier Maurault. Georges Courchesne (*ibid.*).

Mgr. Maruis et l'érection du diocèse de Nicolet. Alphonse Roux (*ibid.*).

Mgr. Joseph-Calixte Marquis et la fondation des soeurs de l'Assomption. Soeur Marie-Immaculée, A.S.V. (*ibid.*).

Mgr. Calixte Marquis colonisateur. J. Ernest Laforce (*ibid.*).

The Last Spanish Census of Pensacola, 1820. Duvon C. Corbitt (*Florida Histor. Quart.*).

Protestants in Mexico. T. F. Doyle (*Thought*, Sept.).

A Philadelphia Editor Looks at Latin America, 1823-1934. J. Orin Oliphant (*Pennsylvania History*, April).

Métodos misionales de la primera instrucción de San Francisco de Borja para la América Española (1567). Felix Zubillaga, S.I. (*Archivum Historicum Societatis Iesu*, 1943).

Expedições missionárias para o Maranhão no seculo XVII. Serafim Leite, S.I. (*Archivum Historicum Societatis Iesu*, 1941).

Zwei Quellenpublikationen zur Geschichte des Paraguaykrieges (1750-1756). Wilhelm Kratz, S.I. (*ibid.*).

La Santa Sede y la Emancipación Mexicana (Chs. IV, V and VI. *Estudios Históricos*, Jan.).

Estudios de historiografía de la Nueva España. Ramón Iglesia (*Filosofía y Letras*, July).

The Captaincy of the Second Portuguese Voyage to Brazil, 1501-1502. William B. Greenlee (*Americas*, July).

Catholic Youth in the Inter-American Century. William Barry (*ibid.*).

Note on the Life of Francisco de Cárdenas Valencia. Eleanor B. Adams (*ibid.*).

The Franciscan Provinces of South America. Marion A. Habig (*ibid.*).

Literary Contributions of Catholics in Nineteenth-Century Mexico. Francis Borgia Steck (*ibid.*).

The Franciscan University of Celaya. Pius Barth (*ibid.*).

Latin American Studies in the Economics Curriculum, with Special Reference to Teaching Material. Henry W. Spiegel (*ibid.*).

Positivism in Mexico. Kurt F. Reinhardt (*ibid.*).

The Land Policy of Argentina, with Particular Reference to the Conquest of the Southern Pampas. A. F. Zimmerman (*The Hispanic Amer. Histor. Rev.*, Feb.).

Efforts to Finance the Aguayo Expedition: A Study in Frontier Fiscal Administration in New Spain. Charmion Shelby (*ibid.*).

The Plan of Casa Mata. Nettie Lee Benson (*ibid.*).

Bolivar and Spanish-American Cooperation. Harold A. Bierck, Jr. (*Pacific Histor. Rev.*, June).

La Iglesia y el Negro en Norteamérica. Ricardo Pattee (*Universidad Católica Bolivariana*, Feb., Mar.).

En el camino de la verdad histórica. II Parte. Pablo Antonio Cuadra (*ibid.*).

Documentos ineditos para la historia de la provincia del Santo Evangelio de México. P. Archivero (*"Anales" de la Provincia Franciscana del Santo Evangelio de México*, Jan.).

Hace Cuatro Siglos en Esta Provincia del Santo Evangelio de México. P. Analista (*ibid.*).

La Iglesia de Santiago Tlaltelolco, su convento y el colegio de San Buenaventura. Fidel de J. Chauvet, O.F.M. (*ibid.*, Apr.).

Las Fundaciones Franciscanas de Tehuacán. Fidel de J. Chauvet, O.F.M. (*ibid.*, July).

Un cuardo real de la infiltración del Hispanismo en el alma India en el llamado "Códice de Juan Bautista". Angel Ma. Garibay K. (*Filosofía y Letras*, Apr.).

Los Jesuítas en la provincia de Quito de 1570 a 1774. C. Bayle, S.I. (*Razón y Fe*, Feb.).

Don Francisco Plancarte Y Navarrete. Alfonso Mendez Plancarte. (*Abside*, IX, 2).

O protestantismo no momento atual brasileiro. Angelo Rossi (*Revista Eclesiástica Brasileira*, Mar.).

Os estudos na provincia da Immaculada Conceição do Brasil nos séculos XVII e XVIII. Basilio Röwer, O.F.M. (*ibid.*).

BOOKS RECEIVED

Anderson, William K. (Ed.), *Making the Gospel Effective.* (Nashville: Commission on Ministerial Training. The Methodist Church. 1945. Pp. 221.) A series of twenty-two essays on economic and social problems and the approach of the minister to them.

Atwood, E. Bagby (Ed.), *Excidium Troiae.* (Cambridge: Mediaeval Academy of America. 1944. Pp. xci, 81. $3.50; to members, $2.80.)

Bagan, Philip V., O.S.B., *The Syntax of the Letters of Pope Gelasius I.* [Catholic University of America Studies in Mediaeval and Renaissance Latin Language and Literature, Vol. XVIII.] (Washington, D. C.: Catholic University of America Press. 1945. Pp. xxiii, 231. $2.50.) The author finds that Gelasius' latinity is generally classical, and that the author is a very conservative writer.

Bailey, Thomas A., *Woodrow Wilson and the Great Betrayal.* (New York: Macmillan Co. 1945. Pp. xii, 429. $3.50.)

Barker, Ernest, *The Development of Public Services in Western Europe, 1660-1930.* (New York: Oxford University Press. 1945. Pp. 93. $1.50.) This little volume, first published in May, 1944, and now reprinted, appeared originally as a section of the fifth volume of Eyre's *European Civilization.* The principal emphasis is on England, Prussia, and France under such headings as administration, conscription, taxation, social services, and education.

Beals, Ralph L., *The Contemporary Culture of the Cáhita Indians.* (Washington: United States Government Printing Office. 1945. Pp. xii, 244. $.50.) This is the second part of Beal's ethnological study on the Cáhita Indians. Many interesting pages are devoted to the religion and fiestas of the Yaqui and Mayo Indians.

Bell, H. C. F., *Woodrow Wilson and the People.* (New York: Doubleday, Doran & Co. 1945. Pp. 392. $3.00.)

Bielak, Valeria, *Mary Theresa Countess Ledóchowska.* (St. Paul: Sodality of St. Peter Claver. 1944. Pp. xxii, 226. $1.00.) This volume is a second edition, revised and amplified, of the original biography of Mary Theresa Ledóchowska, foundress of the Society of St. Peter Claver, which has as its principal objective assistance to the African missions.

Bischoff, William N., S.J., *The Jesuits in Old Oregon.* (Caldwell, Idaho: Caxton Printers. 1945. Pp. xvii, 258. $3.00.)

Bourke, Vernon J., *Augustine's Quest of Wisdom.* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co. 1945. Pp. xi, 323. $3.00.)

Brebner, John Bartlet, *North Atlantic Triangle.* (New Haven: Yale University Press. 1945. Pp. xx, 385. $4.00.)

Brown, Ruth Allison, *S. Aureli Augustini de Beata Vita. A Translation with an Introductory and Commentary.* (Washington: Catholic University of America Press. 1944. Pp. xvii, 193.) This is Volume LXXII of the Patristic Studies of the Catholic University of America.

Bruun, Geoffrey, *Europe in Evolution.* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co. 1945. Pp. xvi, 533. $3.50.)

Bulletin bibliographique de la Société des Ecrivains Canadiens. (Montreal: Thérien Frères Limitée. 1944. Pp. 112.)

Carter, Clarence Edwin, *The Territorial Papers of the United States,* Volume XII, *The Territory of Michigan 1829-1837.* (Washington: United States Government Printing Office. 1945. Pp. vii, 1378. $4.50.)

Cassiere, Ernst, *Rousseau, Kant, Goethe.* [No. 1—History of Ideas Series.] (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1945. Pp. vii, 98. $1.50.)

Dickey, Callas C., *Seargent S. Prentiss, Whig Orator of the Old South.* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press. 1945. Pp. ix, 422. $4.00.)

Ducey, D. Michael, O.S.B. (Ed.), *National Liturgical Week.* (Chicago: Liturgical Conference, Inc. 1945. Pp. ix, 173.) An edition of the papers read at the conference held in New York, December 27-29, 1944.

Faulkner, Harold U., Tyler Kepner, Paul Bartlett. *The American Way of Life.* (New York: Harper & Bros. Revised Edition. 1945. Pp. xviii, 739.) A new edition of a text which first appeared in 1941 to which new materials and illustrations have been added. The volume is intended for students of the last two years of high school and endeavors to serve the needs of the social sciences as well as history proper.

Fink, Zera S., *The Classical Republicans. An Essay in the Recovery of a Pattern of Thoughts in Seventeenth Century England.* (Evanston: Northwestern University. 1945. Pp. xi, 225. $4.00.)

Flower, Robin, *The Western Island.* (New York: Oxford University Press. 1945. Pp. vi, 138. $2.50.) Mr. Flower here tells a tale in both prose and verse of the Great Blasket Island off the coast of Kerry. It is a series of brief stories of the customs and manners of this Irish-speaking island.

Geoghegan, Arthur T., *The Attitude towards Labor in Early Christianity and Ancient Culture.* [Catholic University of America Studies in Christian Antiquity, No. 6] (Washington: Catholic University of America Press. 1945. Pp. xxviii, 250. $2.50.) Father Geoghegan studies the attitude toward manual work in the first five Christian centuries. In Part I he deals with labor among the Greeks, Romans, and Jews as the background for the Christian view. Part II, much the longer, presents the Christian view. Archaeological evidence is demonstrated in plates. There are careful indexes. The subject should have wide appeal.

Grennan, Margaret R., *William Morris-Medievalist and Revolutionary.* (New York: King's Crown Press. 1945. Pp. x, 173. $2.50.)

Higgins, George G., *Voluntarism in Organized Labor in the United States, 1930-1940.* (Washington: Catholic University of America Press. 1944. Pp. ix, 182.) The doctoral dissertation of Father Higgins is Volume 13 in the Studies in Economics of the Catholic University of America. The purpose of the monograph was to examine the attitude of American trade unionists towards the social and labor legislation of the 1930's. The present lively interest in the varying theories of the two groups in American organized labor gives a real timeliness to Father Higgins' discussion of the A. F. of L. and C. I. O. and their reactions to labor legislation during the decade of the thirties.

Hollis, Christopher, *Saint Ignatius.* (New York: Sheed and Ward. 1945. Pp. vii, 287. $2.50.) A reprint of a volume which originally appeared in 1931.

Konovalow, S. (Ed.), *Russo-Polish Relations.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1945. Pp. viii, 102. $1.50.)

Lauterpacht, H., *An International Bill of the Rights of Man.* (New York: Columbia University Press. 1945. Pp. x, 230. $3.00.)

Levy, Babette May, *Preaching in the First Half Century of New England History.* (Hartford: American Society of Church History. 1945. Pp. vii, 215. $3.00.)

Luella, Sister Mary, O.P. (Ed.), *The Catholic Booklist, 1942-1945.* (River Forest, Illinois: Rosary College. 1945. Pp. 101. $.50.) This list of titles of books by or about Catholics and Catholic themes is a production of the Department of Library Science of Rosary College and comprises fourteen divisions beginning with bibliography and ending with a section on children's books. Each division has been done by a separate compiler and the individual items carry brief descriptive notes.

MacSwiney, Terence, *Despite Fools' Laughter.* (London: M. H. Gill and Son, Ltd. 1944. Pp. xvi, 74.)

A Manual of Eastern Orthodox Prayers. Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius. (New York: Macmillan Co. 1945. Paper $.90.) A translation, under Orthodox and Anglican auspices, of prayers from the Euchologion: morning and evening prayers, prayers for different occasions, anthems and hymns, confession and communion prayers, calendar of the Orthodox Church.

Maryknoll Mission Letters. Vol. I, *1945.* (New York: Field Afar Press. 1945. Pp. viii, 55. $.50.) The first volume of the Maryknoll Mission Letters for 1945 contains nine letters from China, eleven from Latin America, and six under the heading of Central America.

Maynard, Theodore, *Pillars of the Church.* (New York: Longmans, Green and Co., Inc. 1945. Pp. xi, 308. $3.00.)

Maynard Theodore, *Too Small a World: The Life of Mother Cabrini.* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co. 1945. Pp. xvi, 335. $2.50.)

McSorley, Joseph, *An Outline History of the Church by Centuries.* (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co. 1945. Pp. xxx, 1084. $7.50.) This fourth revised edition of Father McSorley's volume has been done with a view to "correcting erroneous dates and other inaccuracies, the rewriting of obscure or defective paragraphs, the recasting of the whole treatment of Poland, [and] the selecting and reproducing of appropriate illustrations."

Moorman, John R. H., *Church Life in England in the Thirteenth Century.* (New York: Macmillan Co. 1945. Pp. xxviii, 444. $5.50.)

Morgan, Carlyle, *Bretton Woods: Clues to a Monetary Mystery.* (Boston: World Peace Foundation. 1945. Pp. vii, 138. Cloth $.50; paper $.25.)

Pattee, Ricardo, *El Catolicismo en Estados Unidos.* (Mexico: Editorial Jus. 1945. Pp. 541.)

Prado, J., Simon-Prado, *Praelectionum Biblicarum Compendium II.* Vetus Testamentum liber alter: De doctrina seu de libris didacticis Veteris Testamenti. (Madrid: Edit. El Perpetuo Socorro. Manuel Silvela, 14. 1945. Pp. xvi, 254. 16 pesetas.) This new edition of Father Prado's exegesis of the didactic books of the Old Testament brings the volume abreast of recent biblical research. The excellent volumes of Prado's *Praelectiones* deserve to be known by historians as well as ecclesiastics.

Ranshofen-Wertheimer, Egon F., *The International Secretariat.* (New York: Columbia University Press. 1945. Pp. xxvii, 500. $4.50.) The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace continues its publication of serious volumes on the machinery of international organization. The present work is by a special consultant and research associate of the Endowment and tells the story of the struggles and successes of the Geneva secretariat in the days between the two world wars. It is a heavily-documented work and carries a bibliography and an adequate index.

Reilly, Gerald F., C.SS.R., *Imperium and Sacerdotium according to St. Basil the Great.* [Catholic University of America Studies in Christian Antiquity. No. 7.] (Washington: Catholic University of America Press. 1945. Pp. xx, 159. $1.75.) After a presentation of St. Basil's theory on the subject, the author studies his conflicts with Arian officials of the empire, his connection with judicial matters and social problems of his time, and his willingness to collaborate with the civil government. The study will be useful to political theorists as well as to historians.

Rogers, James Grafton, *World Policing and the Constitution.* (Boston: World Peace Foundation. 1945. Pp. 123. Cloth $.50; paper $.25). The eleventh in the pamphlet series, America Looks Ahead, is contributed by a former Assistant Secretary of State.

Romig, Walter, *The Book of Catholic Authors.* (Detroit: Walter Romig & Co. 1945. Pp. ix, 316. $2.20.) Sketches of Catholic writers furnished by themselves and edited with illustrations by Mr. Romig.

Rosado, Francisco Canton, *Historia de la Iglesia en Yucatan Desde 1887 Hasta Nuestros Dias.* (South America: Compania Tipografica Yucateca. 1943. Pp. vii, 246.)

Sargent, Daniel, *Mitri, The Story of Prince Demetrius Augustine Gallitzin.* (New York: Longmans, Green & Co. 1945. Pp. 327. $3.50.)

Sharkey, Don, *After Bernadette.* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co. 1945. Pp. 166. $2.00.)

Texixeira, Luiz, *Profile of Salazar. Materials for the History of His Life and Times.* (Lisbon: SPN Books. Pp. 77.) This little brochure contains a selection from the speeches and public papers of the Premier of Portugal.

Vlekke, Bernard H. M., *Evolution of the Dutch Nation.* (New York: Roy Publishers. 1945. Pp. xi, 377. $3.50.)

Vlekke, Bernard H. M., *The Netherlands and the United States.* (Boston: World Peace Foundation. 1945. Pp. v, 96. Cloth $.50; paper $.25.) This brochure by a professor of history in the Netherlands Government Historical Institute of Rome is No. 10 of the Pamphlet Series entitled America Looks Ahead which the World Peace Foundation publishes at intervals. It traces the story of American-Dutch relations in five brief chapters and contains a list of suggestions for further reading.

Vlekke, Bernard H. M., *The Story of the Dutch East Indies.* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1945. Pp. xvii, 233. $3.00.)

Wallace, Paul A. W., *Conrad Weiser (Friend of Colonist and Mohawk).* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. 1945. Pp. xiv, 648. $5.00.)

Wolanin, Alphonse S., *Polonica in English. Annotated Catalogue of the Archives and Museum of the Polish Roman Catholic Union.* (Chicago: Polish Roman Catholic Union of America. 1945. Pp. 186.) Dr. Wolanin here gives a catalog of the Chicago collection of the Union dealing with English titles. It represents only one section of the vast collection made by this energetic group of Polish-American students. The catalog is divided into ten sub-divisions which embrace all phases of Polish history and life.

Woodward, W. E., *Tom Paine, America's Godfather.* (New York: E. P. Dutton & Co. 1945. Pp. 359. $3.50. Second Printing.)

Wright, Louis B. and Macleod, Julia H., *First Americans in North Africa.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1945. Pp. vii, 227. $3.00.)

Yedlicka, Brother Leo Charles, F.S.C., *Expressions of the Linguistic Area of Repentance and Remorse in Old French.* [Catholic University of America Studies in Romance Languages and Literature. Vol. XXVII.] (Washington: Catholic University of America Press. 1945. Pp. xx, 439. $4.50.) A detailed study, with careful summaries, indicating the reaction of the mediaeval man to sin.